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REPORT.

BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire as to the various powers now in possession of the Poor Law Guardians, and their adequacy to cope with distress that may from time to time exist in the Metropolis and other populous places; and also as to the expediency of concerted action between the Poor Law authorities and voluntary agencies for the relief of distress.

ORDERED TO REPORT,

That your Committee have met and taken evidence on the subject referred to them, but we have found it impossible during the present Session to complete our inquiry, except so far as regards the Metropolis. We have determined, therefore, to report at once the conclusions which we have arrived at on that branch of the subject, leaving the further inquiry respecting the administration of the Poor Law in other populous places to be resumed during the next Session, if the House should think it desirable to reappoint the Committee.

In the opinion of your Committee it is shown by the evidence that the powers in possession of the Poor Law Guardians in the Metropolis are adequate for the relief of destitution.

It will be seen by the return given in Appendix G. of the number of paupers in the Metropolis on the last day of January in each year from 1857 to 1888, that during the last 30 years there has been a marked decrease of pauperism in the Metropolis.

The numbers have somewhat increased during the last four years, but, if allowance is made for the growth of the population, the number of paupers in every thousand inhabitants has only risen from 24 to 25 in 1884, the lowest number recorded during the whole period, to 25 4 in 1887, and 25 9 in 1888. The number in 1857 was 46 8, and in 1867, the highest year, no less than 55 5.

This decrease must to a great extent be ascribed to the more strict and efficient administration of the law by Boards of Guardians, and especially to the restriction of out-door relief.

It would be, therefore, unsafe to infer that there has been a corresponding diminution of poverty, although it may reasonably be concluded that so great a fall in the number of paupers is partly due to the improved condition of the working classes generally.

The guardians must, no doubt, have been influenced in restricting out-door relief by the Act passed in 1870, by which 5 d. a day was charged on the common fund of the Metropolis for the maintenance of in-door paupers, but we fully believe that they have acted also from the conviction of the evils arising from out-door relief, unless very carefully watched and kept within narrow limits.

It must always be borne in mind that the duty of guardians is to relieve destitution, that is to say, to relieve the poor who are unable without support from the rates to provide themselves with the absolute necessaries of life, and who have no relatives who can be required to maintain them. It is not the duty...
duty of guardians to administer charity in the sense of alleviating the lot of those who are poor but not actually destitute.

We desire to draw especial attention to the evidence respecting the administration of the Poor Law by the Boards of Guardians of Stepney, Whitechapel, and St. George's-in-the-East, showing that the restriction of out-door relief in those districts has been attended by a remarkable diminution of the total number of persons receiving relief from the rates.

Thus, in Stepney, the total number of out-door paupers was 10,092 in 1869 and 1,150 in 1887; in Whitechapel the out-door paupers were 2,568 in 1871 and 1,568 in 1872, and only 63 in 1888, whilst the in-door paupers, allowing for imbeciles at asylums, not included in that class in the earlier years, were, in Stepney, 1,708 in 1869 and 1,670 in 1887; and in Whitechapel 1,219 in 1871 and 1,000 in 1872, as against 1,229 in 1888.

The success of the working of the system pursued by these boards, is, however, essentially dependent on the organised active co-operation of charity with the Poor Law Authorities. Where such co-operation exists, it has been proved that out-door relief may be almost entirely discontinued without cause for dissatisfaction amongst the poor, whilst there are undeniable advantages in a system which gives free scope to judicious charity, and enables the deserving poor to obtain assistance without being reduced to the pauper class. On the other hand, we are of opinion that where no such organised method of charity has been established, out-door relief cannot, without hardship to the poor, be dispensed with in certain cases. But we cannot too strongly insist on the disastrous results which are certain to follow from out-door relief, if not very carefully administered, and kept within narrow limits, not only in bringing heavy burdens on the ratepayers, but, what is far more important, in demoralising the working class by the discouragement of thrift and honest industry; and we draw attention to the evidence of the results of the "policy of giving out-door relief" pursued in the City of London Union as compared with the opposite policy in St. George's-in-the-East. In both districts the resident population contains a large proportion of poor persons, but the latest statistics show that whilst in the City the ratio of paupers per 1,000 of population was 62.2, in St. George's-in-the-East it was 33.9, not much more than half.

It is right to add that the voluntary association, known as the Jewish Board of Guardians, relieves almost all the destitution amongst the Jews, large numbers of whom live in Whitechapel. Their mode of administration is in the form of out-door relief in conjunction with charitable institutions; but the Jewish community differs in so many respects from the rest of the population that it would be unsafe to draw any general conclusions from the practice of the Jewish Board. The funds of the board are, moreover, not derived from the rates.

We now proceed to make some observations on the mode in which relief is afforded to the different classes of destitute persons: first, as regards chronic destitution, and, secondly, temporary and exceptional destitution from sickness or want of work.

In the case of the aged and infirm who are of respectable character, it is a very general practice to give out-door relief, which usually takes the form of small weekly doles, insufficient for the support of the pauper, and which, from the difficulty of ascertaining the true circumstances of the recipients, especially in large towns, are frequently granted to persons who are not really destitute. Such doles are eked out either by private charity or some aid from relatives, or by slender earnings, in which latter case, as is pointed out by Sir H. Owen, "to the extent to which the person, who is assisted in that way, obtains employment, there is no doubt there is a tendency to reduce the rate of wages for services of that particular character." It is obvious that the result must be to produce an unfair competition with workpeople who are supporting themselves without such assistance. Frequently also if the doles were withdrawn, it would be found that there are relatives who are in a position to afford the necessary support, and who would do so when aid was not forthcoming from the rates.

Widows
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Widows left with children to support receive, in some unions, out-door relief; in others, such as Whitechapel, the plan pursued is to give no out-door relief to the mother, but to take such children as she is not able to support into the district schools.

We are of opinion that in those cases where the home and other circumstances of the widow are such that her family cannot be properly cared for, the latter system is the best, but we recommend that careful discrimination be exercised, and that the children should be left with their mother, where she is of good character and able, with an out-door allowance for such children as she cannot support from her earnings, to bring up her family respectfully.

Referring now to temporary and exceptional destitution from sickness or want of work, it is much to be regretted that in the Metropolis there is not more advantage taken of benefit clubs and provident dispensaries, by which provision is made for support and medical treatment during sickness.

Where these clubs and dispensaries are generally made use of, it can but seldom happen in the case of respectable men, that the home is broken up in consequence of the head of the family being compelled on account of temporary sickness to enter the workhouse. In the Metropolis, where lodgings are usually let by the week, there is much more difficulty in retaining the home during the absence of the family, than in the country where cottages are hired for longer periods, and can be shut up for some time until the family is able to return.

An attempt was made in the case of exceptional distress, to meet this difficulty by what is known as the "Whitechapel Order." That Order, which was only issued by the Local Government Board for a period of 12 months, and is not now in force, provided that "it shall be lawful in the case of any able-bodied male person relieved in the workhouse, who shall not, in any one week ending on Saturday, be absent from the workhouse more than once, nor for a period exceeding 24 hours, nor without the consent of the guardians, for the guardians to relieve out of the workhouse, the wife and family of such able-bodied person, and also such person whilst he is so absent from the workhouse as afore-aid, without setting such person to work during the time or any part thereof that he is so absent." As a matter of fact, however, the experiment of the working of this Order has never been tried, as the Whitechapel Board never put it into operation.

The Order prohibiting the relief of the able-bodied out of the workhouse, is not in force in the Metropolis; the regulation is that "every able-bodied person, if relieved out of the workhouse, shall be set to work by the guardians and be kept employed under their direction and superintendence, so long as he continues to receive relief." Under this Order it has been usual to open labour yards in winter in which men are employed, principally in stone breaking.

One of the witnesses, Mr. J. H. Allen, a guardian, and Chairman of the Out-relief Committee in St. Pancras, maintained that a labour yard could be so managed as to be a useful mode of relief; but most of the other witnesses condemned the system as affording no sufficient test of destitution, and being thus largely open to imposition, and tending to demoralise the class which resorts to the yards. We draw particular attention to the evidence of Mr. John Jones, relieving officer of the Stepney Union, and of the Rev. Brooke Lambert, Vicar of Greenwich, and a guardian, as showing the gross abuses which arise in connection with these yards.

Labour yards have been discontinued entirely by several of the boards of Helley, 691, 692. guardians in the Metropolis, and it is noteworthy that in the seven East-end unions, none of which had a labour yard last winter, pauperism is stationary as compared with last year, whilst the pauperism of the whole Metropolis shows an increase.

We recommend that they should cease to form part of the regular authorised system of relief, and should only be opened in cases where, on account of exceptional distress, the ordinary workhouse accommodation is insufficient to meet an emergency.

(70.)
In the evidence of Mr. Henley, one of the Poor Law Inspectors, will be found an interesting account of the "Test House" established at Birmingham for able-bodied men, which has removed the necessity for a labour yard, and has had an "effect beyond the most sanguine expectations of the guardians" on the idle and dissolute class of paupers. A similar test house is about to be built at Liverpool, and we think that such houses might, with great advantage, be established in the Metropolis.

We may mention also in passing, that in order to keep a more thorough check upon out-door relief, the Birmingham Board has appointed an officer termed a "cross visitor," whose duty it is to make visits of surprise upon persons receiving relief, in order to find out whether any fraud is being committed upon the guardians.

We have made inquiry as to the operation and effect of relief works undertaken either by public bodies, such as vestries, or by charitable associations, for the purpose of relieving distress in the winter months. These works are set on foot with excellent intentions, but we must point out that whilst they may occasionally be justifiable as a temporary expedient to meet a special and pressing emergency, they are open to most serious objections, if they are to be regarded as part of a regular system of relief during the winter months. They are based, so far as public bodies are concerned, on the assumption that it is part of the duty of the public authorities to provide employment for all persons who apply for it, when out of work, and their inevitable effect is to discourage habits of thrift and forethought by leading men who earn good wages at other times of the year at trades which are usually slack in winter, to rely on having work found for them in the winter season. Moreover they interfere with the employment of respectable labourers for ordinary wages, they tend to attract to the Metropolis labourers who are out of work in the neighbouring country districts, and they are liable to the same imposture as the labour yards.

In the case of the relief works undertaken by the Chelsea Vestry, the surveyor, Mr. Strachan, who superintended them, informed us that the work was executed in a satisfactory manner, and for the most part, without any loss to the parish, but his evidence as to the class and character of the men employed must not be overlooked.

Much stress has been laid upon the immigration of agricultural labourers as a cause of increased destitution in the Metropolis. The evidence which we have taken on this subject is contradictory, but we incline to the opinion that the influx has been considerably exaggerated, although it cannot be doubted that owing to the depressed condition of agriculture more labourers than usual have recently migrated from the country to London. The effect on metropolitan destitution cannot be estimated by the number of applicants for relief who have come lately from the country, since the tendency of the immigration is to cause a displacement of town labourers, the countrymen being preferred for rough hard work.

Some of the witnesses advocated the establishment of industrial villages or pauper farms under the Poor Law, somewhat resembling the industrial "colonies" in Holland. The Rev. H. Mills said, "that in the neighbourhood of each of the large towns, where there is a great surplus of labour, there could be a plot of land taken, and work given of a productive kind:" "the proper thing to do would be to carry out, say, four or five experimental colonies in connection with the larger towns where the surplus labour is most painfully prominent, and in that way to find out by actual experiment whether or not the labour could be utilised." In the opinion of Mr. F. Peek there should be "a spade farm some little distance away, with sheds, and every one who applied should do a full amount of work for the pay he got." Lord Compton contemplated that if the experiment were successful there might ultimately be a sufficient number of farms to place upon them the whole of the able-bodied pauper population, "so long as it was worked together with emigration."

It is hardly necessary for us to set forth the serious objections to extensive schemes of this kind, if undertaken by the Poor Law authorities or any agency
agency connected with the Government. Apart from the practical difficulties attending them, and from questions of expense, it is to be feared that they would lead to a wide-spread belief that it is the business of the Government to provide work at suitable wages for all who apply to it for employment.

In connection with this subject, we draw attention to the interesting account given by Mr. Mearns of the transfer of 100 unemployed labourers from London to work in Lincolnshire. The success of this operation may probably be ascribed to the fact stated by Mr. Mearns that they were mostly men from the country, who had come up to London owing to the agricultural depression, and were accustomed to work on the land. We have, however, not had the opportunity of ascertaining what per-cent age of the men dealt with were permanently benefited.

With respect to emigration, the powers of the guardians under which they can assist any poor person to emigrate, appear to be sufficient; but we suggest that a proportion of the expenses incurred for this purpose might, in the Metropolis, be properly charged on the common fund. The general policy of State-aided emigration seems to us to be beyond the scope of our inquiry.

We are unable to agree with the opinion expressed by several experienced witnesses that it would be desirable to abolish the casual wards.

We think that paupers belonging to the vagrant and casual class, for various reasons, could not be dealt with otherwise than as a separate class, so that practically it would always be necessary to maintain a separate department of the workhouse for their reception. It has been suggested that larger powers of detaining casual paupers should be given to the guardians, and that such powers should be made applicable also to paupers commonly known as "ins and outs," that is, paupers who make a practice of discharging themselves, and returning to the workhouse at short intervals. Under the present law a casual pauper is not entitled to discharge himself before nine o'clock in the morning of the second day following his admission, and if he has been admitted more than once during one month into any casual ward of the same union before nine o'clock in the morning of the fourth day after his admission, Sunday being excluded in both cases from the computation. For this purpose, the whole of the Metropolis is regarded as one union. The guardians are empowered to direct that these detentions shall not be enforced in the case of a particular class or classes of casual paupers, and the superintendent of the casual ward has also discretionary power of discharging a casual pauper before the expiration of the prescribed period of detention.

It might, perhaps, be advisable, in the case of casual paupers, to somewhat further extend the power of detention, where the pauper has been re-admitted, say, within a period of 14 days. On the other hand, casual paupers should be allowed to discharge themselves at an earlier hour than nine o'clock, which is too late in the day for them to obtain employment. This last opinion accords with the view of the Local Government Board, which they have expressed in circular letters of 16th April 1885 and 7th November 1887, addressed to the several boards of guardians.

With regard to the "ins" and "outs," it cannot be denied that the evils arising from the practice are considerable, especially as affecting children, who cannot be sent to any permanent school, if their parents are constantly going in and out of the workhouse, but we agree with Sir Hugh Owen that it is very doubtful whether sufficient grounds exist to justify any general power of compulsory detention of paupers in workhouses, and it would be exceedingly difficult to define any particular class, outside the vagrant class, who should be liable to such detention, or to specify in an Act of Parliament the circumstances in which they should be so liable.

Formerly the sick wards were a department of the workhouse, but the great majority of the sick poor in London are now treated in infirmaries, which are under an administration distinct from the workhouse, and are superintended by a resident medical officer, assisted by a steward and a matron, with a trained staff of nurses. Similar infirmaries have been established at Birmingham and other large towns. It was stated to us that in consequence of the excellence
of the treatment in these infirmaries, and their separation from the workhouses, the poor are so ready to resort to them that there is a tendency to regard them as a kind of "State hospital," entrance into which does not imply that the patient is a pauper. The Birmingham guardians feel so strongly upon this matter that they have determined to make all persons who come to their infirmary pass through the gate which leads to the workhouse grounds, so that they may not draw a distinction between the workhouse and the infirmary.

The unavoidable effect of gratuitous treatment of the sick, is to discourage the poor from supporting provident medical clubs and dispensaries. Miss Octavia Hill stated that "it is almost impossible to establish a provident dispensary near large free hospitals," and Mr. Loch, the secretary to the Charity Organisation Society, gave similar evidence. Mr. Loch suggests that there should be a Royal Commission of inquiry into the whole matter of hospitals and infirmaries.

Section 29 of the Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867 enacted that where an asylum "is provided for the relief of the sick and insane, it may be used for purposes of medical instruction, and for the training of nurses in such cases and manner, and subject to such regulations as the Poor Law Board may from time to time by Order direct." This section was, however, repealed in 1869. We are disposed to agree with Dr. Bridges, the Local Government Board Medical Inspector for London, that, "with proper precautions," clinical teaching "should be allowed, in the interests of the patients of the infirmary and also in the interests of the public." The infirmaries are now very large and important establishments; in the Kensington infirmary there are over 600 patients, and there seems to be no reason why, since large numbers of poor patients are treated in hospitals without any objection on their part to clinical teaching, the poor should feel repugnance to such teaching in infirmaries. Dr. Bridges pointed out that a special ground for giving the medical profession access to the infirmaries is that many patients suffering from obscure and chronic disease are treated in the infirmaries, who cannot be admitted into hospitals.

We have received much evidence on the important branch of Poor Law administration, which relates to the bringing up and education of children. The practice of the metropolitan boards of guardians varies considerably; in some cases, orphan and deserted children are, as far as possible, boarded out with foster parents at a distance from London; in others, they are, in common with other children of paupers, sent to the district schools.

We have received no evidence to show that the district schools are not carefully managed, but it has been strongly impressed upon us that, especially in the case of the very large schools, and as regards girls, the results of the training in them are unsatisfactory.

Mr. J. C. Sherrard, a guardian of Paddington, says, "I find that the children turned out of those schools are for the most part wanting in intelligence. They have no practical knowledge whatever of life; they are brought up together in large masses, and have no practical training; therefore they have no self-reliance, and are not fitted to battle with the outside world at all. And it is especially bad for the girls; I have found that the girls are really helpless." Mr. T. C. Jones, a guardian of Marylebone, says, "In the case of the girls a very large number turn out unsatisfactorily." Mr. H. Hardcastle, a guardian of St. George's, Hanover-square, Union, says the training in such large institutions "makes the children into mere machines." "For instance, a child leaves the school at the age of 12 or 13, and cannot tell the time by the clock, and thinks that the water which runs down automatically for it to wash with has something to do with the rain that comes down from heaven." Mr. G. Holland says, "I notice a very large number of the children who come out of these schools, principally the girls, appear just like a deer let out of a cart before the hunt, looking about vacantly in every direction; they appear to know nothing at all." The Rev. J. W. Horsley, formerly chaplain of Clerkenwell Prison, says, "A girl who has been brought up in the semi- conventual life of a district school, where we have 600 girls massed together and known only by their numbers, does not know what the temptations are, or how to meet them, and she more readily falls." A great many such girls had come under his notice as prisoners. "They are a class by themselves; they have the same characteristics,
characteristics, and are turned out of the same mould." "They are not more vicious than others, but more incapable of virtue; passive, sluggish, boneless." Similar evidence was given by Mrs. Charles. On the other hand the inquiries which have been made by the Society for Befriending Young Servants, with regard to the pauper girls who are sent to service from the district schools of the Metropolitan Unions and parishes, show that the results are more favourable than this evidence would suggest. There are serious disadvantages, such as those to which reference has been made, which are inseparable from any system under which a number of children are brought up together without any home influence or any contact with the outer world, but we cannot doubt that they are much aggravated by the overgrown size of the metropolitan district schools.

The policy of the Birmingham guardians is to place the children under their charge in "cottage homes," in each of which there are about 30 children. Mr. Henley, one of the Local Government Board inspectors, speaks very favourably of these homes, which appear to offer many advantages over the large district schools; and similar homes have been established by the Kensington and Shoreditch guardians; but in the case of orphan and deserted children, we do not think that any better plan can be adopted than that of boarding them out in the country, under the supervision of committees approved by the Local Government Board, provided that the most careful discrimination is exercised in the selection of the homes. The regulations for boarding-out now in force, which are described by Sir H. Owen, seem to us to be judicious; and most of the witnesses speak favourably of the system of boarding-out at a distance from the union to which the children belong, especially in the case of girls. We think it important that care should be taken that the standard which is required for the food and clothing of boarded-out children should not be in any way above that of the children of respectable labourers in the same village; and we desire also to call attention to the observations of Miss Hall on the absence of any sufficient security that the certified boarding-out committees, when once sanctioned, are kept up in a state of efficiency.

The number of children boarded out from the metropolitan unions at the present time is not more than 600 or 700, but even if all the children capable of being boarded out were so dealt with, it must be borne in mind that there will always be a large number who must be brought up in Poor Law schools.

In regard to the opinion expressed by some of the witnesses, that magistrates should have the power of giving to the guardians the legal custody of the children of "vicious parents," we must observe that the Industrial Schools Acts enable children to be removed from the custody of their parents in certain specified cases; and the term "vicious parents" appears to us to be far too vague as a definition of persons who should be liable to have their children taken from them. We think, however, that power might be given to guardians to retain in their custody children who have been deserted by their parents at an early age, are claimed by them after the lapse of a long period during which they have been boarded out, or brought up in Poor Law schools. This would prevent "vicious parents" from claiming their children for the purpose of obtaining their earnings, and enable the guardians to save children, respectably brought up, from being compelled to return to a life of misery and perhaps crime.

We were glad to learn from the Rev. B. Waugh, the Honorary Secretary of the London Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, that the society have had "very few cases indeed" in which any charge of cruelty could be brought against any of the officers connected with the poor law institutions. But his evidence shows that the proceedings of the society have disclosed a startling number of cases of starvation, where the parents were punishable for neglect to provide sufficient food for their children, under the Act 31 & 32 Vict. c. 122, sec. 37, which enacts that in such cases "the guardians of the union or parish in which the child may be living shall institute the prosecution, and pay the cost thereof out of their funds." We recommend that the Local Government Board should call the special attention of guardians to their powers and responsibilities under this Act.

(70.)

Some
Some doubts appear to have been raised whether the Act, by directing that the guardians shall institute the prosecution, does not exclude other persons from prosecuting under the section in question. We think that if there is any room for such doubts, they should be removed by legislation.

Before leaving the subject of children, we wish to draw attention to the evidence of Miss M. H. Mason, the Local Government Board Inspector of boarded-out children. We believe that great advantage is derived from entrusting this branch of official inspection to a lady, and we recommend that the system of lady inspectors should be further extended so as to secure the more complete inspection of boarded-out children, and also the inspection of the female and children’s wards in workhouses, and of the staff of nurses, and other female officers.

We fully concur in the “expedience of concerted action between the guardians and voluntary agency for the relief of distress.”

The evidence shows how effectively this co-operation is secured in St. George’s-in-the-East, Stepney, and Whitechapel, and the excellent results which are obtained there, both in diminishing the number of persons relieved from the rates, and in providing for assistance to the deserving poor, without inflicting upon them the stigma of pauperism. It is much to be desired that such co-operation should be organised elsewhere. Mr. Loch, who described us the working of the Charity Organization Society, of which he is Secretary, in referring to the present chaotic condition of London charities said: “The endowed charities are administered without any special reference to the voluntary charities. There are the parochial voluntary charities, which may be administered without any reference to the endowed charities. Then, again, there are the very many individuals who intervene, and the very many societies, putting aside also the chapels.” If Mr. Loch’s estimate that the endowed and voluntary relief, irrespective of what is given directly, amounts to “something like 3,000,000 l. a year,” is well founded, ample means are available in the Metropolis, if well organised and directed, for dealing with such cases of poverty and distress as are not fit subjects for relief from the rates.

The evils which arise from indiscriminate charity were strikingly shown by the effects of the distribution of the Mansion House Fund, and of tickets to vagrants in Trafalgar-square. Miss Octavia Hill made some interesting remarks on this subject.

Some further points remain to be mentioned. Our inquiry shows that there are wide divergencies in the system of administration pursued by the various metropolitan boards of guardians, and admitting that the guardians should within certain limits be able to adapt their policy to the particular circumstances of each district, it cannot be regarded as satisfactory that there should be in adjoining districts such a marked difference in practice as now sometimes exists. For example, in some districts, as has been shown above, there are labour yards, in others they have been altogether discontinued; and in the labour yards themselves there are such wide variations in the scale of relief in different districts as between 2 s. 4 d. and 5 s. 6 d. a week.

We have recommended the general discontinuance of labour yards, except for special reasons; but as regards the general want of uniformity, it would probably be difficult, as Sir H. Owen says, for the Local Government Board to go much further than they have done in the way of regulation; and the best mode of securing some approach to uniformity would be by periodical conferences of delegates from the different metropolitan boards of guardians.

In order to preserve continuity in the system of administration, it would, we think, be desirable that boards of guardians should have the power to make bye-laws regulating their procedure, which, when confirmed by the Local Government Board, should be binding on the guardians until altered by the same authority.

With the same object some of the witnesses suggest that the election of guardians should be triennial, or that one-third of the Board should be elected each year.

The
The rapid growth of the population in some parts of the Metropolis seems to require that the areas of poor law administration should be readjusted. It is unreasonable to expect that a Board consisting of 26 members, such as that of the Wandsworth and Clapham Union, can satisfactorily administer a union containing a population which is believed to have increased from 210,434 at the last census to nearly 300,000.

Lastly, we may notice a suggestion that guardians should have the same power to attach a pension, received by a pauper from a private source, and legally due to him, as they have of attaching an army or navy pension.

And your Committee have directed the Minutes of Evidence, with an Appendix, to be laid before your Lordships.

30th July 1888.
ORDER OF REFERENCE.

Die Veneris, 16° Martii, 1888.

POOR LAW RELIEF.

Moved, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire as to the various powers now in possession of the Poor Law Guardians, and their adequacy to cope with distress that may from time to time exist in the Metropolis and other populous places; and also as to the expediency of concerted action between the Poor Law Authorities and voluntary agencies for the relief of distress (The Viscount Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen); after short debate, agreed to.

Die Jovis, 22° Martii, 1888.

Select Committee on: The Lords following were named of the Committee:—

Earl of Milltown. Earl of Onslow.
Earl of Strafford. Earl of Kimberley.
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen). Lord Balfour.
Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun). Lord Thring.

The Committee to meet To-morrow, at Three o'clock, and to appoint their own Chairman.

Die Jovis, 19° Aprilis, 1888.

The Evidence taken before the Select Committee from time to time to be printed for the use of the Members of this House; but no copies thereof to be delivered, except to Members of the Committee, until further order.

Die Veneris, 27° Aprilis, 1888.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury discharged from attendance, and the Earl of Jersey, the Lord Bishop of Rochester, and the Lord Sandhurst added to the Select Committee.
LORDS PRESENT, AND MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AT EACH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE.

Die Veneris, 23° Martii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer.  Lord Balfour.
Earl of Onslow. Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Earl of Strafford. Lord Thring.
Earl of Kimberley. Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

The Order of Reference is read.

It is moved that the Earl of Kimberley do take the Chair.

The same is agreed to.

The course of Proceeding is considered.

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday the 19th of April, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Jovis, 19° Aprilis, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer. Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Earl of Milltown. Lord Balfour.
Earl of Onslow. Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Earl of Strafford. Lord Thring.
Earl of Kimberley.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Friday the 23rd of March last are read.

The following Witness is called in, and examined, viz.:—Sir Hugh Owen, k.c.b. (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Lunae, 23° Aprilis, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer.
Earl of Milltown.
Earl of Onslow.
Earl of Strafford.
Earl of Kimberley.
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Lord Balfour.
Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.
The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday last are read.
The following Witness is called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. Joseph John Henley (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o’clock.

Die Jovis, 26° Aprilis, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer.
Earl of Milltown.
Earl of Onslow.
Earl of Strafford.
Earl of Kimberley.
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Lord Balfour.
Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.
The Proceedings of the Committee of Monday last are read.
The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. Robert Hedley and Mr. James Stewart Davey (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o’clock.

Die Lunae, 30° Aprilis, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Jersey.
Earl Spencer.
Earl of Milltown.
Earl of Onslow.
Earl of Strafford.
Earl of Kimberley.
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Lord Bishop of Rochester.
Lord Balfour.
Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.
The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday last are read.
The Order of the House of Friday last, discharging the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury from attendance, and adding the Earl of Jersey, the Lord Bishop of Rochester, and the Lord Sandhurst to the Committee, is read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. John Jones and the Rev. J. Llewellyn Davies (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Jovis, 3rd Maii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Jersey. | Lord Balfour.
Earl Spencer. | Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Earl of Milltown. | Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Strafford. | Lord Thring.
Earl of Kimberley. | Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Monday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. Albert Pell, the Rev. Charles Henry Turner, and Miss Octavia Hill (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Luna, 7th Maii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Jersey. | Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Earl Spencer. | Lord Bishop of Rochester.
Earl of Milltown. | Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Earl of Onslow. | Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Strafford. | Lord Thring.
Earl of Kimberley. | Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. Augustus G. Crowder, Miss Marianne Harriet Mason, and the Rev. William P. Jay (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Eleven o'clock.
Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—The Reverend Herbert Mills, the Rev. Prebendary Billing, and the Rev. Brooke Lambert (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday the 4th of June next, at Twelve o’clock.

---

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Monday the 14th of May last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. Francis Peek and Mr. James Corry Sherlock (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o’clock.

---

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Monday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Miss Louisa Twining, Mr. James Henry Allen, and Mr. George Richardson Struchan (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o’clock.
SELECT COMMITTEE ON POOR LAW RELIEF.

Die Luna, 11° Junii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer.
Earl of Onslow.
Earl of Strafford.
Earl of Kimberley.
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

LORD BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.
LORD BALFOUR.
LORD SANDHURST.
LORD THRING.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. Joseph Stephenson Horn, Mr. Thomas Charles Jones, The Rev. John F. Kitto, and Mr. James Harding (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Luna, 18° Junii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer.
Earl of Onslow.
Earl of Strafford.
Earl of Kimberley.
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

Lord Bishop of Rochester.
Lord Balfour.
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Thring.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—The Earl Compton and Miss Wilhelmina L. Hall (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Jovis, 21° Junii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer.
Earl of Milltown.
Earl of Onslow.
Earl of Strafford.
Earl of Kimberley.
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

Lord Balfour.
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Thring.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Monday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. Charles Loch, the Rev. Andrew Mearns, and the Lord Balfour (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

(70.)
Die Lunae, 25° Junii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer.  
Earl of Milltown.  
Earl of Strafford.  
Earl of Kimberley.  
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

Lord Balfour.  
Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).  
Lord Sandhurst.  
Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz. — Mr. William Vallance and Mr. Robert Arthur Valpy (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Jovis, 28° Junii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Onslow.  
Earl of Strafford.  
Earl of Kimberley.  
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

Lord Bishop of Rochester.  
Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).  
Lord Sandhurst.  
Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Monday last are read.

The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz. — Mr. Henry Hardcastle, Mr. Lionel Lido Alexander, and Mr. George Holland (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.

Die Luna, 2° Julii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl Spencer.  
Earl of Milltown.  
Earl of Strafford.  
Earl of Kimberley.  
Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

Lord Bishop of Rochester.  
Lord Balfour.  
Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).  
Lord Sandhurst.  
Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.
SELECT COMMITTEE ON POOR LAW RELIEF.

The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday last, are read.
The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Mr. William Mitchell Acworth and the Rev. Robert Henry Hadden (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.

---

Die Jovis, 5° Julii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Jersey. | Lord Balfour.
Earl of Milltown. | Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetown).
Earl of Onslow. | Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Strafford. | Lord Thring.
Earl of Kimberley. | Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Orders of adjournment read.
The Proceedings of the Committee of Monday last are read.
The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—Dr. John Henry Bridges, Mr. Edward L. Brandreth, and the Rev. Charles Henry Bowden (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday the 16th instant, at Eleven o'clock.

---

Die Luna, 16° Julii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Jersey. | Lord Bishop of Rochester.
Earl Spencer. | Lord Balfour.
Earl of Milltown. | Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetown).
Earl of Onslow. | Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Strafford. | Lord Thring.
Earl of Kimberley. | Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.
The Proceedings of the Committee of Thursday the 5th instant are read.
The following Witnesses are called in, and examined, viz.:—The Rev. J. W. Horsley, Mrs. Charles, the Rev. Benjamin Waugh, the Honourable Sydney Holland, Mr. Francis C. Ball, and Mr. Henry Joseph Hagger (vide the Evidence).

Ordered, That the Committee be adjourned till Monday the 30th instant, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Luna, 30° Julii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Jersey, | Lord Bishop of Rochester.
Earl Spencer, | Lord Balfour.
Earl of Osslow, | Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetown).
Earl of Miltown, | Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Strafford, | Lord Thring.
Earl of Kimberley, | Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).

The Earl of Kimberley in the Chair.

Order of adjournment read.

The following DRAFT REPORT is laid before the Committee by the Chairman.

"1. That the Committee have met and taken evidence on the subject referred to them, but they have found it impossible during the present Session to complete their inquiry, except so far as regards the Metropolis. They have determined, therefore, to report at once the conclusions which they have arrived at on that branch of the subject, leaving the further inquiry respecting the administration of the Poor Law in other populous places to be resumed during the next Session, if the House should think it desirable to re-appoint the Committee for that purpose.

"2. In the opinion of your Committee it is shown by the evidence that the powers in possession of the Poor Law Guardians in the Metropolis are adequate for the relief of destitution.

"3. It will be seen by the Return given in Appendix G. of the number of Paupers in the Metropolis on the last day of January in each year from 1857 to 1888, that during the last 30 years there has been a marked decrease of pauperism in the Metropolis.

"4. The numbers have somewhat increased during the last three years, but, if allowance is made for the growth of the population, the number of paupers in every thousand inhabitants has only risen from 24 to 25 in 1884, the lowest number recorded during the whole period, to 25.5 in 1887, and 26.5 in 1888. The number in 1857 was 46.8, and in 1867, the highest year, no less than 55.5.

"5. This decrease may, to a great extent be ascribed to the more strict and efficient administration of the law by the Board of Guardians, and especially to the restriction of out-door relief.

"6. It would be, therefore, unsafe to infer that there has been a corresponding diminution of poverty, although it may reasonably be concluded that so great a fall in the number of paupers is partly due to the improved condition of the working classes generally.

"7. The guardians must, no doubt, have been influenced in restricting out-door relief by the Act passed in 1870, by which 5 d. a day was charged on the common fund of the Metropolis for the maintenance of in-door paupers, but we fully believe that they have acted also from the conviction of the evils arising from out-door relief, unless very carefully watched and kept within narrow limits.

"8. It must always be borne in mind that the duty of guardians is to relieve destitution, that is to say, to relieve the poor who are unable without support from the rates to provide themselves with the absolute necessaries of life, and who have no relatives who can be required to maintain them.

"9. It is not the duty of guardians to administer charity in the sense of alleviating the lot of those who are poor but not actually destitute. The tendency of our-door relief is to become a system of doles which, from the difficulty of ascertaining the true circumstances of the recipients, especially in large towns, are frequently granted to applicants who are not really destitute.

"10. It
"10. It is obvious, also, that where relief is given in aid of insufficient earnings, the tendency must be to produce an unfair competition with workpeople who are supporting themselves without such assistance, and, in some cases, to lower the rate of wages.


"11. We would draw especial attention to the evidence respecting the administration of the Poor Law by the Boards of Guardians of Stepney, Whitechapel, and St. George's-in-the-East, showing that the restriction of out-door relief within very narrow limits has been attended by a remarkable diminution of the total number of persons receiving relief from the rates.

"12. Thus, in Stepney, the total number of out-doors paupers was 10,022 in 1869, and 1,150 in 1887; of in-door paupers, 1,708 in 1869, and 1,670 in 1887. In Whitechapel the out-door paupers were 2,568 in 1871, and 1,568 in 1872, and only 63 in 1888, whilst the in-door paupers, allowing for imbeciles at asylums, not included in that class in the earlier years, were 1,219 in 1871, and 1,000 in 1872, as against 1,229 in 1888.


"13. The successful working of the system adopted by these boards, is, however, essentially dependent on the organised active co-operative of charity with the Poor Law Authorities. Where such co-operation exists, it has been proved that out-door relief may be almost entirely discontinued without causing dissatisfaction amongst the poor, whilst there are undeniable advantages in a system which gives free scope to judicious charity, and enables the deserving poor to obtain assistance without being reduced to the pauper class. On the other hand, your Committee are of opinion that where no such organised method of charity has been established, out-door relief cannot, without hardship to the poor, be dispensed with in certain cases. But we cannot too strongly insist on the disastrous results which are certain to follow from indiscriminate out-door relief, not only in bringing heavy burdens on the ratepayers, but, what is far more important, in demoralising the working class by the discouragement of thrift and honest industry; and we would point to the evidence of the results of the 'policy of giving out-door relief' pursued in the City of London Union as compared with the opposite policy in St. George's-in-the-East.

Vallance, 4498.

"14. In both districts the resident population contains a large proportion of poor persons, but the latest statistics show that whilst in the City the ratio of paupers per 1,000 of population was 62.2, in St. George's-in-the-East it was 33.9, not much more than half.

"15. It is right to add that the Jewish Board of Guardians relieve almost all the destitution amongst the Jews, large numbers of whom live in Whitechapel. Their mode of administration is one of out-door relief in conjunction with charitable institutions; but the Jewish community differs in so many respects from the rest of the population that it would be unsafe to draw any general conclusions from the practice of the Jewish Board. The funds of the board are, moreover, not derived from the rates.

Hadden, 5324-5335, 5430, 5431.

"16. We now proceed to make some observations on the mode in which relief is afforded to the different classes of destitute persons. First, as regards chronic destitution.

"17. In the case of the aged and infirm who are of respectable character, it is a very general practice to give out-door relief, which usually takes the form of small weekly doles, insufficient for the support of the pauper. Such doles are eked out either by private charity or some aid from relatives, or by slender earnings, in which latter case, as is pointed out by Sir H. Owen, 'to the extent to which the person, who is assisted in that way, obtains employment, there is no doubt there is a tendency to reduce the rate of wages for services of that particular character.' Frequently also if the doles were withdrawn, it would be found that there are relatives who are in a position to afford the necessary assistance, and who would do so when aid was not forthcoming from the rates.


"18. Widows left with children to support receive, in some unions, similar doles to those above-mentioned, in others, such as Whitechapel, the plan pursued is to give no outdoor relief to the mother, but to take such children as she is not able to support into the district schools.

Jones, 3420, 3421, 4480.

"19. We are of opinion that in those cases where the home and other circumstances of the widow are such that her family cannot be properly cared for, the latter system is the best, but we recommend that careful discrimination be exercised, and that the children should be left with their mother, where she is of good character and able, with an outdoor allowance for such children as she cannot support from her earnings, to bring up her family respectably.

"20. Secondly, temporary and exceptional destitution from sickness or want of work.

"21. It is much to be regretted that in the Metropolis, as appears from the evidence, so little advantage is taken of benefit clubs, by which provision is made for support during sickness.

(70.) c 3 "22. Where...
"22. Where these clubs are largely made use of, it can but seldom happen in the case of respectable men, that the home is broken up in consequence of the head of the family being compelled on account of temporary sickness to enter the workhouse.

"23. But this, of course, does not apply to destitution from want of work, and it is pointed out that in the Metropolis, where lodgings are usually let by the week, there is much more difficulty in retaining the home during the absence of the family, than in the country where cottages are hired for longer periods, and can be shut up for some time until the family is able to return.

"24. An attempt was made in the case of exceptional distress, to meet this difficulty by what is known as the 'Whitechapel Order.' That Order, which was only issued by the Local Government Board for a period of 12 months, and is not now in force, provided that 'it shall be lawful in the case of any able-bodied male person relieved in the workhouse, who shall not, in any one week ending on Saturday, be absent from the workhouse more than once, nor for a period exceeding 24 hours, nor without the consent of the guardians, for the guardians to relieve out of the workhouse, the wife and family of such able-bodied person, and also such person whilst he is so absent from the workhouse as aforesaid, without setting such person to work during the time or any part thereof that he is so absent.'

"25. As a matter of fact, however, the experiment of the working of this Order has never been tried, as the Whitechapel Board never put it into operation.

"26. The Order prohibiting the relief of the able-bodied out of the workhouse is not in force in the Metropolis; the regulation is that 'every able-bodied person, if relieved out of the workhouse, shall be set to work by the guardians, and be kept employed under their direction and superintendence, so long as he continues to receive relief.'

"27. Under this Order it has been usual to open labour yards in winter in which men are employed, principally in stone breaking.

"28. One of the witnesses, Mr. J. H. Allen, a guardian, and chairman of the out-relief committee in St. Pancras, maintained that a labour yard could be so managed as to be a useful mode of relief; but most of the other witnesses condemned the system as affording no sufficient test of destitution, and being largely open to imposture, and tending to demoralise the class which resorts to the yards. We would draw particular attention to the evidence of Mr. John Jones, relieving officer of the Stepney Union, and of the Rev. Brooke Lambert, Vicar of Greenwich, and a guardian, as showing the gross abuses which arise in connection with these yards.

"29. Labour yards have been discontinued entirely by several of the boards of guardians in the Metropolis, and it is noteworthy that in the seven East-end unions, none of which had a labour yard last winter, pauperism is stationary as compared with last year, whilst the pauperism of the whole Metropolis shows an increase.

"30. We recommend that they should cease to form part of the regular authorised system of relief, and should only be opened upon the issue of a special order of the Local Government Board, for a limited period, in cases where, on account of exceptional distress, the ordinary workhouse accommodation is insufficient to meet an emergency.

"31. In the evidence of Mr. Henley, one of the Poor Law Inspectors, will be found an interesting account of the 'Test House' established at Birmingham for able-bodied men, which has removed the necessity for a labour yard, and has had an 'effect beyond the most sanguine expectations of the guardians' on the idle and dissolute class of paupers. A similar test-house is about to be built at Liverpool, and we think that such houses might, with great advantage, be established in the Metropolis.

"32. We may mention also in passing, that in order to keep a more thorough check upon out-door relief, the Birmingham Board has appointed an officer termed a 'cross visitor,' whose duty it is to make visits of surprise upon persons receiving relief, in order to find out whether any fraud is being committed upon the guardians.

"33. We have made inquiry as to the operation and effect of relief works undertaken either by public bodies, such as vestries, or by charitable associations, for the purpose of relieving distress in the winter months. These works are set on foot with excellent intentions, but we must point out that whilst they may occasionally be justifiable as a temporary expedient to meet a special and pressing emergency, they are open to most serious objections, if they are to be regarded as part of a regular system of relief during the winter months. They are based, so far as public bodies are concerned, on the assumption that it is part of the duty of the public authorities to provide employment for all persons who apply for it, because they are out of work, and their inevitable effect is by leading men who earn good wages at other times of the year, at trades which are usually slack in winter, to rely on having work found for them in the winter season, and thus to discourage habits of thrift and forethought. Moreover, they interfere with the employment of respectable labourers for ordinary wages, they tend to attract to the Metropolis labourers who are out of work in the neighbouring county districts, and they are liable to the same imposture as in the labour yards.
34. In the case of the relief works undertaken by the Chelsea Vestry, the surveyor, Mr. Strachan, who superintended them, informed us that the work was executed in a satisfactory manner, and, for the most part, without any loss to the parish, but at the same time he put the cases of imposture as high as 50 per cent.

35. Much stress has been laid upon the immigration of agricultural labourers as a cause of increased destitution in the Metropolis. The evidence which we have taken on this subject is contradictory, but we incline to the opinion that the influx has been considerably exaggerated, although it cannot be doubted that owing to the depressed condition of agriculture more labourers than usual have recently migrated from the country to London. The effect on metropolitan destitution cannot be estimated by the number of applicants for relief who have come lately from the country, since the tendency of the immigration is to cause a displacement of town labourers, the countrymen being preferred for rough hard work.

36. Some of the witnesses advocated the establishment of industrial villages or pauper farms under the Poor Law, somewhat resembling the industrial 'colonies' in Holland. The Rev. H. Mills said, 'that in the neighbourhood of each of the large towns, where there is a great surplus of labour, there could be a plot of land taken, and 'work given of a productive kind; 't' the proper thing to do would be to carry out, say, four 'or five experimental colonies in connection with the larger towns where the surplus labour 'is most painfully prominent, and in that way to find out by actual experiment whether 'or not the labour could be utilised.' In the opinion of Mr. F. Peek there should be a 'spade farm some little distance away, with sheds, and every one who applied should do 'a full amount of work for the pay he got.' Lord Compton contemplated that if the experiment were successful there might ultimately be a sufficient number of farms to place upon them the whole of the able-bodied pauper population, 'so long as it was worked together with emigration.'

37. It is hardly necessary for us to set forth the serious objections to extensive schemes of this kind, if undertaken by the Poor Law authorities or any agency connected with the Government. Apart from the practical difficulties attending them, and from questions of expense, it is to be feared that they would lead to a wide-spread belief that it is the business of the Government to provide work at suitable wages for all who apply to it for employment. But we think such a small experiment as Mr. Loch recommends might possibly be worth trying.

38. In connection with this subject, we would draw attention to the interesting account given by Mr. Mears of the transfer of 100 unemployed labourers from London to peat works in Lincolnshire. The success of this operation may probably be ascribed to the fact stated by Mr. Mears that they were mostly men from the country, who had come up to London owing to the agricultural depression, and were accustomed to work on the land.

39. With respect to emigration, the powers of the guardians under which they can assist any poor person to emigrate, appear to be sufficient; we would suggest, however, that expenses incurred for this purpose might, in the Metropolis, be properly charged on the common fund. The general policy of State-aided emigration seems to us to be beyond the scope of our inquiry.

40. We are unable to agree with the opinion expressed by several experienced witnesses that it would be desirable to abolish the casual wards.

41. We think that paupers belonging to the vagrant and casual class, for various reasons, could not be dealt with otherwise than as a separate class, so that practically it would always be necessary to maintain a separate department of the workhouse for their reception. It has been suggested that larger powers of detaining casual labourers should be given to the guardians, and that they should be made applicable also to paupers, commonly known as 'ins and outs,' that is, paupers who make a practice of discharging themselves, and returning to the workhouse at short intervals. Under the present law a casual pauper is not entitled to discharge himself before nine o'clock in the morning of the second day following his admission, and if he has been admitted more than once during one month into any casual ward of the same union, before nine o'clock in the morning of the fourth day after his admission, Sunday being excluded in both cases from the computation. For this purpose the whole of the Metropolis is regarded as one union.

42. It might, perhaps, be advisable to somewhat further extend the power of detention, when the pauper has been re-admitted, say, within a period of 14 days. Casual paupers should be allowed to discharge themselves at an earlier hour than nine o'clock, which, it has been pointed out to us, is too late in the day for them to obtain employment.

43. With regard to the 'ins' and 'outs;' it cannot be denied that the evils arising from the practice are considerable, especially as affecting children, who cannot be sent to any permanent school, if their parents are constantly going in and out of the workhouse, but we agree with Sir Hugh Owen that it is very doubtful whether sufficient grounds exist to justify any general power of compulsory detention of paupers in workhouses, and
it would be exceedingly difficult to define any particular class, outside the vagrant class, who should be liable to such detention, or to specify in an Act of Parliament the circumstances under which they should be so liable.

Bridges, 5461. "44. Formerly the sick wards were a department of the workhouse, but the great majority of the sick poor in London are now treated in infirmaries, which are under an administration distinct from the workhouse, and are superintended by a resident medical officer, assisted by a steward and a matron, with a trained staff of nurses. Similar infirmaries have been established at Birmingham and other large towns. It was stated to us that in consequence of the excellence of the treatment in these infirmaries, and their separation from the workhouses, the poor are so ready to resort to them that there is a tendency to regard them as a kind of State hospital, entrance into which does not imply that the patient is a pauper. The Birmingham guardians feel so strongly upon this matter that they have determined to make all persons who come to their infirmary pass through the gate which leads to the workhouse grounds, so that they may not draw a distinction between the workhouse and the infirmary.

Hill, 1671. "45. The unavoidable effect of indiscriminate gratuitous treatment of the sick, whether in Poor Law infirmaries or in hospitals, is to discourage the poor from supporting provident medical clubs and dispensaries. Miss Octavia Hill stated that it is almost impossible to establish a provident dispensary near large free hospitals, and Mr. Loch, the secretary to the Charity Organisation Society, gave similar evidence. Mr. Loch suggests that there should be a Royal Commission of inquiry into the whole matter of hospitals and infirmaries.

Twining, 3012. "47. The infirmaries are now very large and important establishments; in the Kensington Infirmary there are over 600 patients, and there seems to be no reason why, since large numbers of poor patients are treated in hospitals without any objection on their part to clinical teaching, the poor should feel repugnance to such teaching in infirmaries.

Bridges, 5474. "48. Dr. Bridges pointed out that a special ground for giving the medical profession access to the infirmaries is that many patients suffering from obscure and chronic disease are treated in the infirmaries, who cannot be admitted into hospitals.

Jones, 3470. "49. We have received much evidence upon the important branch of Poor Law administration, which relates to the bringing up and education of children. The practice of the metropolitan boards of guardians varies considerably; in some cases, orphan and deserted children are, as far as possible, boarded out with foster parents at a distance from London; in others, they are, in common with other children of paupers, sent to the district schools.

Owen, 50. "50. We have received no evidence to show that the district schools are not carefully managed, but it has been strongly impressed upon us that, especially in the case of the very large schools, and, as regards girls, the results of the training in them is unsatisfactory.

Sherrard, 2826. "51. Mr. J. C. Sherrard, a guardian of Paddington, says, 'I find that the children turned out of those schools are, for the most part, wanting in intelligence. They have no practical knowledge whatever of life; they are brought up together in large masses, and they have no practical training; therefore they have no self-reliance, and are not fitted to battle with the outside world at all. And it is especially bad for the girls; I have found that the girls are really helpless.' Mr. T. C. Jones, a guardian of Marylebone, says, 'In the case of the girls a very large number turn out unsatisfactorily.' Mr. H. Harcastle, a guardian of St. George's, Hanover-square, Union, says the training in such large institutions 'makes the children into mere machines.' 'For instance, a child leaves the school at the age of 12 or 13, and cannot tell the time by the clock, and thinks that the water which runs down automatically for it to wash with has something to do with the rain that comes down from heaven.' Mr. G. Holland says, 'I notice a very large number of the children who come out of these schools, principally the girls, appear just like a deer let out of a cart before the hunt, looking about vacantly in every direction; they appear to know nothing at all.' The Rev. J. W. Horsley, formerly chaplain of Clerkenwell Prison says, 'A girl who has been brought up in the semi-conventional life of a district school, where we have 600 girls massed together and known only by their numbers, does not know what the trees are, how to meet them and she more readily falls. A great many such girls had come under his notice as prisoners. 'They are a class by themselves; they have the same characteristics, and are turned out of the same mould.' 'They are not more vicious than others, but more incapable of virtue; passive, sluggish, backbonless.' Similar evidence was given by Miss Charles.

"52. Some
"52. Some of these evils are inseparable from any system under which a number of
children are brought together without any home influence or any contact with the
outer world, but we cannot doubt that they are much aggravated by the overcrowded size
of the metropolitan district schools.

"53. The policy of the Birmingham guardians is to place the children under their
charge in 'cottage homes,' in each of which there are about 50 children. Mr. Henley,
one of the Local Government Board inspectors, speaks very favourably of these homes,
which appear to offer many advantages over the large district schools; but in the
case of orphan and deserted children, we do not think that any better plan can be adopted
than that of boarding them out in the country under the supervision of committees
approved by the Local Government Board. The regulations for boarding-out now in
force, which are described by Sir W. Owen, seem to us to be judicious; and most of the
witnesses speak favourably of the system of boarding-out at a distance from the union to
which the children belong, especially in the case of girls. We think it important that
care should be taken that the standard which is required for the food and clothing of
boarded-out children should not be in any way above that of the children of respectible
labourers in the village; and we would also call attention to the observations of Miss
Hall on the absence of any sufficient security that the certified boarding-out committee,
when once sanctioned, are kept up in a state of efficiency.

"54. The number of children boarded out from the Metropolitan unions at the present
time is not more than 500 or 700, but even if all the children capable of being boarded
out were so dealt with, it must be borne in mind that there will always be a large number
who must be brought up in district and other Poor Law schools.

"55. In regard to the opinion expressed by some of the witnesses, that magistrates
should have the power of giving to the guardians the legal custody of the children of
'seous parents,' we would observe that the Industrial Schools Acts enable the children
to be removed from the custody of their parents in certain specified cases; and the term
'seous parents' appears to us to be far too vague as a definition of persons who should
be liable to have their children taken from them. We think, however, that power might
be given to guardians to retain their custody children who have been neglected by
their parents at an early age, are claimed by them after the lapse of a long period during
which they have been boarded out, or brought up in Poor Law schools. This would
prevent vicious parents from claiming their children for the purpose of obtaining their
earnings, and enable the guardians to save children, respectably brought up, from being
compelled to return to a life of misery and perhaps crime.

"55A. We were glad to learn from the Rev. B. Waugh, the Honorary Secretary of the
London Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, that the society have had
'Very few cases indeed' in which any charge of cruelty could be brought against any of
the officers connected with the Poor Law institutions. But his evidence shows that the
proceedings of the society have disclosed a startling number of cases of starvation, where
the parents were punishable for neglect to provide sufficient food for their children,
under the Act 31 & 32 Vict. c. 122, sect. 37, which enacts that in such cases 'the guar-
dians of the union or parish in which the child may be living shall institute the prosecu-
tion, and pay the cost thereof out of their funds.' We recommend that the Local
Government Board should call the special attention of boards of guardians to their powers
and responsibilities under this Act.

"55B. Some doubts appear to have been raised whether the Act, by directing that
the guardians shall institute the prosecution, does not exclude other persons from pro-
cuting under the section in question. We think that if there is any room for such doubts,
they should be removed by legislation.

"56. Before leaving the subject of children, we would mention the evidence of Miss
M. H. Mason, the Local Government Board Inspector of boarded-out children.

"57. We believe that great advantage is derived from entrusting this branch of official
inspection to a lady, and that it would be desirable that the system of lady inspectors
should be extended to the inspection of the female and children's wards in workhouses,
and of the staff of nurses, and other female officers.

"58. We fully concur in the 'expediency of concerted action between the guardians
and voluntary agency for the relief of distress.'

"59. The evidence shows how effectively this co-operation is secured in St. George's-
in-the-East, Stepney, and Whitechapel, and the excellent results which are obtained there,
both in diminishing the number of persons relieved from the rates, and in providing for
assistance to the deserving poor, without inflicting upon them the stigma of pauperism.
It is much to be desired that such co-operation should be organised elsewhere. Mr. Loch,
who described to us the working of the Charity Organization Society, of which he is
Secretary, pointed out the present chaotic condition of London charities. 'The endowed
charities are administered without any special reference to the voluntary charities.
There are the parochial voluntary charities, which are administered without any reference
to the endowed charities. Then, again, there are the very many individuals
who intervene, and the very many societies, putting aside also the chapels.' He estimates,
(70.)

D. W. H. S. 1866.

"59. The evidence shows how effectively this co-operation is secured in St. George's-
in-the-East, Stepney, and Whitechapel, and the excellent results which are obtained there,
both in diminishing the number of persons relieved from the rates, and in providing for
assistance to the deserving poor, without inflicting upon them the stigma of pauperism.
It is much to be desired that such co-operation should be organised elsewhere. Mr. Loch,
who described to us the working of the Charity Organization Society, of which he is
Secretary, pointed out the present chaotic condition of London charities. 'The endowed
charities are administered without any special reference to the voluntary charities.
There are the parochial voluntary charities, which are administered without any reference
to the endowed charities. Then, again, there are the very many individuals
who intervene, and the very many societies, putting aside also the chapels.' He estimates,
(70.)
if Mr. Loch’s estimate that the endowed and voluntary relief, irrespective of what is given directly, amounts to ‘something like 3,000,000 l. a year,’ is well founded, ample means are available in the Metropolis, if well organised and directed, for dealing with such cases of poverty and distress as are not fit subjects for relief from the rates.

“60. The evils which arise from indiscriminate charity were strikingly shown by the effects of the distribution of the Mansion House Fund, and of tickets to vagrants in Trafalgar-square.

“61. Amongst other evidence we would draw attention to some interesting remarks of Miss Octavia Hill on this subject.

“62. Some further points remain to be mentioned. Our inquiry shows that there are wide divergencies in the system of administration pursued by the various metropolitan boards of guardians, and admitting that the guardians should within certain limits be able to adopt their policy to the particular circumstances of each district, it cannot be regarded as satisfactory that there should be in adjoining districts such a marked difference in practice as now sometimes exists.

“63. For example, in some districts, as has been shown above, there are labour yards in others they have been altogether discontinued; and in the labour yards themselves there are such wide variations in the scale of relief in different districts as between 2s. 4d. and 5s. 6d. a week.

“64. We have recommended the general discontinuance of labour yards, except for special reasons; but as regards the general want of uniformity, it would probably be difficult, as Sir H. Owen says, for the Local Government Board to go much further than they have done in the way of regulation; and the best mode of securing some approach to uniformity would be by periodical conferences of delegates from the different metropolitan boards of guardians.

“65. In order to preserve continuity in the system of administration, it would, we think, be desirable that boards of guardians should have the power to make bye-laws regulating their procedure, which, when confirmed by the Local Government Board, should be binding on the Board until altered by the same authority.

“66. With the same object some of the witnesses suggest that the election of guardians should be triennial, or that one-third of the Board should be elected each year.

“67. The rapid growth of the population in some parts of the metropolis seems to require that the areas of Poor Law administration should be readjusted. It is unreasonable to expect that a Board consisting of 26 members, such as that of the Wands- worth and Clapham Union, can satisfactorily administer a union containing a population which is believed to have increased from 210,434 at the last census to nearly 300,000.

“68. Lastly, we would notice a suggestion that guardians should have the same power to attach a pension, received by a pauper from a private source, as they have of attaching an army or navy pension. There seems to be no reason why all pensions legally due to a pauper should not be put on the same footing.”

The same is considered, and several Amendments are made therein.

On paragraph 13, it is moved by the Earl Spencer to leave out “indiscriminate” in line 10 of the paragraph.

Objected to:—On Question that the word proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Milltown.</td>
<td>Ear of Jersey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strafford.</td>
<td>Earl Spencer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Kimberley.</td>
<td>Earl of Onslow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen)</td>
<td>Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hope- town).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Bishop of Rochester.</td>
<td>Lord Sandhurst.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers being equal: resolved in the negative.

It is then moved by the Earl Spencer to insert after “Out-door Relief” in line 10, the words “if not very carefully administered and kept within narrow limits.”

It is moved by the Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen) to insert in lieu of the words proposed the words, “unless very carefully and strictly administered.”
On Question, That the words proposed by the Earl Spence be inserted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents (7)</th>
<th>Not Contents (4).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl Spence.</td>
<td>Earl of Jersey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Milltown.</td>
<td>Earl of Onslow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strafford.</td>
<td>Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Kimberley.</td>
<td>Lord Thring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Balfour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetown).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Sandhurst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further Amendments are made, and the paragraph, as amended, is agreed to.

On Paragraph 19, it is moved by the Lord Balfour to omit the same for the purpose of inserting the following paragraph in lieu thereof:

"One of the witnesses stated that 'the more respectable the widow the more grateful she was for this form of relief.' The chief object of this arrangement has been to save a widow from the demoralising effect of receiving out-door relief. We see no reason to doubt that in the large majority of cases the assistance rendered by receiving some of the children into the district school is less likely to be followed by permanent dependence of the mother on the rates than when the relief is in the form of out-door relief. At the same time we consider that there must be many cases in which the character of the mother and her home is such as to render it undesirable to remove the children from the home of the mother. We think, therefore, that no hard and fast rule should be adopted in these cases, but that careful discretion should be exercised, and that each case should be considered in connection with its particular circumstances."

- **Objected to.**—On Question that the paragraph proposed to be left out stand part of the Report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents (9).</th>
<th>Not Contents (3).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Jersey.</td>
<td>Earl of Onslow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Spence.</td>
<td>Lord Balfour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Milltown.</td>
<td>Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strafford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Kimberley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Bishop of Rochester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Thring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Paragraph 30.—It is moved by the Lord Balfour to leave out the words "upon the issue of a special order of the Local Government Board."

- **Objected to.**—On Question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents (3).</th>
<th>Not Contents (5).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl Spence.</td>
<td>Earl of Jersey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Milltown.</td>
<td>Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strafford.</td>
<td>Lord Balfour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Hopetoun.</td>
<td>Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Thring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further Amendment is made, and the paragraph, as amended, is agreed to.

On Paragraph 37.—The words, "But we think such a small experiment as Mr. Loch recommends might possibly be worth trying," are struck out.

It is moved by the Lord Balfour to insert, in lieu thereof, the following words:

"Speaking with reference to the questions connected with the vagrant and casual poor, Mr. Loch made the following recommendation:

"I think that if any land that could be had cheap was used, the men might be drafted by pick from casual wards to the care of a thoroughly competent manager, and they might be looked after, and as far as possible detained, and as far as possible reformed, made business-like, and punctual, and strengthened, far, say, three months or so. I think that is worth trying."

"Would you give a power of compulsory detention?"

"No, I should not myself; I should try it on a purely voluntary plan, and try it purely experimentally; but I think it is worth trying in that humble manner; the problem, you see, of dealing with the casual is so very different. You apply detention and strong remedies to a certain point; naturally he stays away, but he may roam the country all the
the same. On the other hand, if you have a lax system, he comes in, as he would into the general ward, where he can talk to other people, and he is in no way better by the plan at all; and I, for my part, would not use the Poor Law, at any rate in the case of adults, by way of a reformatory system. I think that is far better done with all the difficulties underlying the question, by voluntary means.'

"Although we should not ourselves expect much from such an experiment, it might possibly be worth trying on a small scale, and by means of voluntary agency."

Upon this it is moved by the Earl of Onslow to leave out the last two lines of the proposed Amendment, for the purpose of inserting the following words in lieu thereof: "But we think such an experiment as Mr. Loch recommends would be worth trying if worked by private charity in co-operation with the Poor Law, and not as a part of the Poor Law system."

On Question, That the words proposed by the Lord Balfour stand part of the Amendment to be moved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents (7)</th>
<th>Not Contents (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl Spencer.</td>
<td>Earl of Onslow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Milltown.</td>
<td>Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strafford.</td>
<td>Lord Thring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Kimberley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Balfour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Sandhurst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Question, That the words proposed to be inserted stand part of the paragraph:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents (5)</th>
<th>Not Contents (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Onslow.</td>
<td>Earl of Jersey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strafford.</td>
<td>Earl Spencer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).</td>
<td>Earl of Milltown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Balfour.</td>
<td>Earl of Kimberley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).</td>
<td>Lord Sandhurst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Thring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paragraph, as amended, is then approved.

On paragraph 46, it is moved by the Lord Balfour to leave out from "1869" to the end of the paragraph for the purpose of inserting the following words: "Dr. Bridges pointed out that many of the patients in the infirmaries are suffering from obscure and chronic diseases. These cases, on account of their chronic character, are not admitted into the hospitals, and in the interests of the patients themselves, as also in the interests of the public, it is desirable that facilities should be afforded to medical men for visiting the infirmaries for clinical observation, and we are disposed to agree with Dr. Bridges in this view."—Objected to.—On Question, That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the paragraph:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents (8)</th>
<th>Not Contents (3).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Jersey.</td>
<td>Earl of Onslow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Spencer.</td>
<td>Lord Balfour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Milltown.</td>
<td>Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strafford.</td>
<td>Lord Thring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Kimberley.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Sandhurst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Thring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is then moved by the Lord Thring to insert at the end of the paragraph the following words: "Provided that the admission to the infirmary should be confined to duly qualified medical men and the more advanced students."—Objected to.—On Question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents (5)</th>
<th>Not Contents (6).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Onslow.</td>
<td>Earl of Jersey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Strafford.</td>
<td>Earl Spencer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).</td>
<td>Earl of Milltown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Balfour.</td>
<td>Earl of Kimberley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).</td>
<td>Lord Thring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Sandhurst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paragraph is then approved.

It is moved by the Lord Balfour to leave out the paragraph 67.
On Question, That the said paragraph stand part of the Report:

Contents (7).
- Earl of Jersey.
- Earl Spencer.
- Earl of Milltown.
- Earl of Kimberley.
- Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
- Lord Sandhurst.
- Lord Thring.

Not Contents (4).
- Earl of Onslow.
- Earl of Strafford.
- Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetown).
- Lord Balfour.

The Draft Report is then agreed to, as amended (vide the Report).

Ordered, That the Lord in the Chair do make the said Report to the House.
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THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, K.G., IN THE CHAIR.

SIR HUGH OWEN, K.C.B., having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

1. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You are now the Permanent Secretary of the Local Government Board, and have been for some time connected with that Department?

Yes; I have been Secretary of the Board since 1882, and for a long time previously I was connected with the Department.

2. The Committee have been appointed to inquire, first, as to the various powers now in possession of the poor law guardians, and their adequacy to cope with distress that may from time to time exist in the Metropolis and other populous places. Taking first the Metropolis, I am right, am I not, in saying that it is the duty of the guardians to give relief in all cases of absolute destitution which are brought to their notice?

Yes; it is clearly the duty of the guardians to give such relief as may be necessary in all cases of actual destitution.

3. And they do so under regulations laid down by your Board?

That is so.

4. They are empowered, are they not, to give relief in such manner, and to such amount as in their discretion they may think right, and your Board has no power to order relief or to interfere as regards the amount or nature of the relief to be granted in any individual case?

The Board are expressly precluded by statute from interfering as regards the relief given in any individual case, but they are empowered to issue regulations, laying down general rules, with which the guardians must comply.

5. Will you state generally the effect of the regulations at present in force with regard to out-door relief by boards of guardians in the Metropolis?

The date of the order from which I am about to quote is the 14th of December 1852; but it has been made applicable subsequently to unions which have been formed since that date. The order provides that in any case in which the guardians allow relief for a longer period than one week, without requiring that the person shall be received into the workhouse, the relief shall be given or administered weekly, or at such more frequent...
frequent periods as they may deem expedient. It then provides that it shall not be lawful for the guardians to establish any applicant for relief in trade or business; nor to redeem from pawn for any such applicant, any tools, implements, or other articles; nor to purchase and give to such applicant any tools, implements, or other articles, except articles of clothing or bedding, where urgently needed; nor to pay, directly or indirectly, the expense of the conveyance of any poor person to another district, unless he is conveyed under the provisions of some statute, or under an order of justices or other lawful authority. They are not to pay wholly or in part the rent of the house or lodging of any pauper, nor to apply any portion of the relief ordered to be given to any pauper in payment of any such rent, nor to retain any portion of such relief for the purpose of directly or indirectly discharging such rent, in full or in part, for any such pauper. This provision, however, is not to apply to any shelter or temporary lodging procured for a poor person in any case of sudden or urgent necessity, or mental imbecility. Then there arc provisions which, subject to certain exceptions, prohibit the grant of relief to persons not resident in the union.

6. Chairman. Could you tell us what those provisions about the non-resident poor are?

No relief is to be given from the poor rates of the union to any person who does not reside in some place within the parish or union, except in the following cases: "First, the case of a person casually within such parish, and destitute; secondly, the case of a person requiring relief on account of any sickness, accident, or bodily or mental infirmity, affecting him or her, or any of his or her family; thirdly, the case of a widow, having a legitimate child dependent on her for support, and no illegitimate child born after the commencement of her widowhood, and who at the time of her husband's death was resident with him in some place other than the parish of his legal settlement, and not situated in the union in which such parish is comprised; fourthly, the case of a child under the age of 16, maintained in a workhouse or establishment for the education of poor children, not situated within the union or parish; fifthly, the case of the wife or child, residing within such parish or union, of some person not residing therein; sixthly, the case of a person who has been in the receipt of relief from such parish, or from some parish in the union from which he or she seeks relief at some time within the 12 calendar months next preceding the date of this order."

7. Do I rightly understand that the effect of that order is to prohibit, in the Metropolis, any out-door relief being given to a pauper belonging to a given parish in the Metropolis, but resident in another union; is that so; does your order prohibit that?

No, the order does not prohibit all non-resident relief. The rule as to non-resident relief is the same in the Metropolis as it is in the country generally. The remaining provisions apply chiefly to able-bodied males. First, no relief is to be given to any able-bodied male person while he is employed for wages or other hire or remuneration by any person. Then "every able-bodied male person, if relieved out of the workhouse, shall be set to work by the guardians, and be kept employed under their direction and superintendence, so long as he continues to receive relief." There are certain exceptions to that rule. Compliance with the regulation is not imperative in the case of a person receiving relief on account of sudden and urgent necessity; the case of a person receiving relief on account of any sickness, accident, or bodily or mental infirmity affecting such person, or any of his family; the case of a person receiving relief for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the burial of any of his family; the case of the wife, child, or children of a person confined in any gaol, or place of safe custody; or the case of the wife, child, or children resident within the parish or union of a person not residing therein. Then there is an article which enables the guardians, if they deem it expedient, to depart from any of the regulations with regard to granting relief to persons not residing in the union, or granting relief to adult able-bodied persons, provided that within 21 days they report the departure and
and the grounds of their decision to the Local Government Board. Unless the Local Government Board decline to approve of the relief, the relief given by the guardians is to be regarded as legally given.

8. Lord Balfour of Burley.] It comes to this, that as regards able-bodied males relief must either be given by admission into the workhouse, or the man must be set to work by way of a labour test?
Yes, when the necessity for the relief arises from want of work.

9. But if given under a labour test, am I right in assuming that you regard the labour as a test, and that you do not regard the relief as wages for work done?
That is so. The duty devolves upon the guardians of giving such relief as the necessities of the case may require, and the amount of the relief would vary according to the number of the members of the family depending upon the man. A man having a family dependent upon him would necessarily have a larger amount by way of relief than a single man would receive, although the single man might actually get through a larger amount of work than the married man with children depending upon him.

10. Earl of Milltown.] The amount of relief bears no proportion to the amount of work done; is that so?
That is so; the task of work is merely a test of destitution.

11. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Are you clearly of opinion that without such a test of destitution, either by the offer of the workhouse or the labour test, no relief should be given in the metropolis?
With regard to the cases referred to that is certainly my view.

12. Do you think that there would be any reasonable ground for fear that if relief were given otherwise than subject to these conditions, too great a burden would be laid on the rates?
There would be really no effective check on imposition; and not only do I think the rates would be unduly burdened, but I also think, in the interests of the poor themselves, it is most inexpedient that able-bodied males seeking relief on the ground of being out of work should have facilities of obtaining out-door relief without their destitution being tested either by an offer of the workhouse or by a labour test.

13. Referring to the question which may be said to arise as to whether the powers possessed by the guardians are adequate to cope with destitution that may exist in the metropolis, what is your opinion as to that?
I think that they are amply sufficient to cope with any such distress as it is their duty to deal with.

14. Can you give the Committee any idea of the amount of the rateable value of the property of the metropolis which is liable to the poor rate?
I think that the annual rateable value is about 31,000,000 l.

15. Have you any information as to the amount of the rates levied as poor rates in the different parishes in the metropolis?
A Return was presented to the House of Commons in 1886, giving the amount of the several rates raised in each parish of the metropolis during the year ended the 25th March 1885. The poor rates vary considerably in the different parishes. For instance, taking two poor parishes, Bethnal Green and St. George's-in-the-East, in Bethnal Green the poor rates during the year were 3s. 1d., and in St. George's-in-the-East 3s. In Hampstead and St. George's, Hanover-square, during the same period the rates were 1s. 11d. in the £.

16. Practically, there is no limit, is there, to the amount which the guardians may call for, for the relief of actual destitution?
No limit whatever; they are empowered to issue precepts from time to time to the overseers calling upon them to contribute such sums as they may find necessary, or estimate to be necessary, for the relief of the poor.

(70.)
17. Chairman.] Could you have prepared for us a Table for the whole metropolis, showing the amount of rates levied, the number of out-door paupers, the number of in-door paupers, and comparing the percentages on population, both of the expenditure and the number of out-door and in-door paupers respectively, in the various unions in London?

There would be no difficulty in doing that; only there is one point I should like to mention. In London the population is largely increased in the course of a few years, but we should be obliged to work out the percentages on the population of 1881. The population of some districts has varied very much since that time.

18. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Will you give us the total receipts in the metropolis for the year ended Lady Day 1887 from poor rates, and in aid of poor rates, including Treasury payments?

The amount, excluding receipts from loans, was 3,168,000 l.

19. And the total expenditure in respect of relief of the poor for the same year was what?

£2,123,000; that is the expenditure in respect of the relief of the poor.

The sums raised by the poor rates are not applied exclusively to the relief of the poor, the poor rates having to bear a number of other charges which are quite independent of poor relief. I am mentioning that to explain the difference between the total amount I gave as the receipts from and in aid of poor rates and the total expenditure on relief.

20. Will you give us a statement of the total pauperism of the metropolis in the last week for which returns are available?

The last return is for the second week of the present month. The return gives the total number of paupers, exclusive of lunatics in asylums and vagrants. The total number was 105,829. Of these 59,341 were in-door paupers, and 46,488 out-door paupers.

21. What was the number for the corresponding weeks in the three preceding years?

In 1887 the total number was 98,763; in 1886 it was 97,077; and in 1885 it was 90,010.

22. Chairman.] Could we be furnished with the percentage on the estimated population for those years?

We obtain the estimated population from the Registrar General, who makes his estimate for the whole of London, but he does not give estimates for the minor areas in London.

23. But would not the whole of London be included in the numbers you have given us. I merely want to know whether you could give us the percentage on the estimated population for the three respective years of the whole of London, so as to enable us to see whether the increase of pauperism is absolute as well as merely an increase in numbers?

There would be no difficulty in working out those percentages for the whole of London.

24. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Comparing the year 1885 with the present year, the chief increase has been in the out-door poor, has it not?

That is so. The increase of out-door poor was 11,113, and of in-door poor 4,706.

25. I understand that you can give us a statement for a series of years, say 30 years, as to metropolitan pauperism, which will show the numbers both of in-door and out-door poor?

Yes; a statement of that character is contained in the statistics of pauperism for the month of January last; it applies to the first and fifth weeks of January, and shows in respect of each year from 1857 to 1888 the number of in-door and out-door poor, and the total.

26. I will not ask you all the figures, but let us take some years. What was the proportion of paupers to each thousand of the population in the metropolis in the last week of January in the present year?

27. What
27. What was it in 1880?
267.

28. Ann in 1870?
52.3 per 1,000.

29. And if the proportion in the year 1870 were maintained at the present time, taking into account the increased population, what would the number be at the present time?
If the proportion were the same now as in 1870, the number of paupers on the last day in the last week of January would have been 220,400, instead of 109,000.

30. Earl of Milltown.] Have you the percentage?
It is just about double. The actual number is 109,000; and the number would have been, if the same proportion had been kept up, 220,000. So that it is about double.

31. Lord Balfour of Burley.] To make it quite fair, will you just tell the Committee in which year a special measure came into force charging the in-door paupers on the whole metropolis?
It was 1870. Mr. Gathorne Hardy's Act came into force in 1867. A large number of expenses were charged upon the metropolitan common poor fund under that Act. Then by Mr. Goschen's Act, which was passed in 1870, a sum at the rate of 5 d. per head per day for the maintenance of in-door poor, that is to say, poor in workhouses, became a charge upon the fund.

32. What, in your opinion, is the reason that metropolitan pauperism has not increased proportionately with the population?
I think that it is to a very great extent due to the stricter administration on the part of boards of guardians. Out-door relief has not been given so lavishly latterly as it was in earlier years.

33. And a considerable change has taken place in the workhouse arrangements since Mr. Gathorne Hardy's Act of 1867, which you have just mentioned, has there not?
There has been a most marked change in the arrangements with reference to poor law relief in the metropolis since that Act was passed.

34. A large number of infirmaries have been established, have they not, distinct from the workhouses?
Yes. Formerly the sick were almost always in sick wards in the same buildings as the other classes of the poor; but now there is scarcely a union or parish in the metropolis that has not its separate infirmary.

35. Can you give any statistics as to the amount of additional infirmary accommodation that has been provided?
Since 1867 no less than 11,000 beds, in separate infirmaries (which are, to all intents and purposes, hospitals), have been provided; and I may say that, in the case of the majority of these buildings, the principle of construction that has been adopted is the pavilion system; so that the hospital building consists of blocks that are practically separate, only being connected by passages.

36. And with regard to the internal arrangements for nursing the sick, those have been greatly improved, have they not?
At the present time there are certainly more than a thousand paid nurses employed in London. In 1866 the total paid nursing staff was 111; and in the whole of the London workhouses there were but three night nurses.

37. And as regards medical attendance, has there been a similar improvement?
Yes. Formerly the arrangement was that a medical man, who almost always had private practice, acted as medical officer, and he attended for a certain time each day; but the time was very limited, and he had very frequently (indeed it was the general rule) to provide, at his own cost, the medicines for the sick poor; that is to say, the salary assigned to him was to cover (70.)
the cost of the drugs which he had to supply. Now, in each of these infirmaries there is a resident medical superintendent, who devotes his whole time to his duties; he has an assistant, who is also resident, and gives his whole time; and the whole of the drugs and medical and surgical appliances are supplied and paid for by the guardians, a portion of the cost being repaid from the Parliamentary grant.

38. All this points to there having been a very great advance made in the arrangements in the metropolis for the care of the sick poor?

There has been a very marked advance in connection with the care of the sick. It is supposed that the establishment of these infirmaries has tended somewhat to increase the number of persons who become chargeable on the rates; that the infirmaries are regarded by many persons very much as hospitals, and that persons who would be most unwilling to go into a workhouse, have no reluctance at all to go into these separate infirmaries. That is one result that has followed their establishment. But for the sick poor, there is no doubt that they are of the greatest possible benefit.

39. That is with regard to persons suffering from general ailments and diseases. With regard to fever and small-pox, patients suffering from them are under the charge of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, are they not?

Yes. The change with regard to that matter is also the result of Mr. Hardy's Act. Previously to that time, the fever and small-pox patients were, to some extent, provided for in wards connected with the workhouses, and in other cases they were sent to either the London Fever Hospital, or the London Small-pox Hospital, the only hospitals in London that would receive patients suffering from those diseases. The Metropolitan Asylums Board now have hospital at Stockwell, Hampstead, Homerton, Fulham, and Deptford, and a convalescent hospital at Winchmore Hill. They have also ambulance stations, which are in telephonic communication with the offices of the managers in Norfolk-street, Strand. When a communication is to a patient suffering from small-pox or fever is received at the offices, directions are given by telephone for an ambulance to be sent. The ambulance is accompanied by a nurse and an assistant. Within a short time after the receipt of the request, an ambulance is at the door of the house from which the patient is to be removed. If the case is one of fever, the patient is removed to one of the land hospitals; if of small-pox of so serious a character that removal to a distance would be attended with risk, the patient is also taken to a land hospital; but if not of so grave a character, he is taken to one of the wharves at the river side for conveyance to the hospital ships. There are three of these receiving wharves on the river, and in connection with them there have been three ambulance steamers. In the time of an epidemic several passages are made each day. On board these steamers are nurses and a medical attendant, with all necessary hospital appliances, and the treatment of the patient commences the moment he is received on board. By these steamers the patients are taken down the river to hospital ships at Purfleet. There are two of these ships, the "Atlas" and the "Castalia," accommodating about 300 patients. There is a third vessel, the "Eudymion," which is used for the accommodation of the officers. At Darent, within about two miles of the ships, is a hospital camp, to which the convalescent patients are removed, and, of course, by means of this camp the managers are able to set free, much more quickly than they otherwise would do, the beds in the asylums which are provided for the cases in the acute stages of the disease. The patients are practically well for some time before they can be discharged, and the camp is available for these cases. The managers had at one time as many as a thousand convalescent patients at this camp. So that it may be considered that the arrangements as regards the fever and small-pox patients are of a very satisfactory character.

40. There is another class of unfortunate people who are now under the charge of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, namely, imbeciles?

Formerly the lunatics or imbeciles whose condition was not such as to require that they should be sent to a county asylum, were retained in the workhouses. Under Mr. Gathorne Hardy's Act a board was constituted to provide asylum accommodation for cases of that character, and the Act provided that the cost of

---
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the maintenance of patients in these asylums should be borne by the Common Poor Fund of the metropolis. The result was that all the imbeciles were removed from the workhouses, and no cases of that character are now retained in the workhouses, except for such time as may be necessary for obtaining orders of removal to a county asylum, where such removal is required, or for removal to one of the asylums of the Metropolitan Asylums Board. The managers have asylums at Leavesden, Caterham, and Darenth. They provide altogether for about 6,000 patients. The asylum at Darenth is appropriated to a considerable extent for imbecile children; and the results of the special education that the children receive there have been most satisfactory.

41. Earl of Milltown.] When was the Asylums Board constituted?
Mr. Hardy’s Act was passed in 1867, and the Board was constituted in the same year.

42. According to the provisions of his Act?
It was the result of his Act.

43. Lord Balfour of Burley.] The managers of the Metropolitan Asylums District have also a training ship to which boys are sent from the Metropolitan Unions, have they not?
Yes, they have the ship “Exmouth,” which is moored off Grays.

44. Do you consider that the result of that is satisfactory?
Very much so. I have here the Report of the Captain Superintendent for the last year. He gives these figures as the result: With regard to the boys who have been admitted since 1876, when the school was placed under the charge of the managers, the total number of boys admitted was 3,507; of these 901 have entered the Royal Navy; 1,127 the Mercantile Marine; 419 entered the Army as musicians; eight were discharged to situations, three of whom subsequently went to sea; and 469 were discharged to their respective unions; 18 died; that makes a total of 2,942; and 565 remain under training. There is a long list appended to the report of the different regimental bands in which boys have been placed.

45. Earl of Onslow.] It is not a reformatory school?
No, it is simply a training ship to which boys are sent by the guardians.

46. They are not sent there by the magistrates?
Not by the magistrates.

47. Lord Balfour of Burley.] The education of pauper children, children for one reason or another chargeable to the metropolitan unions, is entirely carried out at establishments distinct, and generally at a distance from the workhouse, is it not?
Yes; Mr. Hardy’s Act provided that the cost of the maintenance of children in separate schools should be a charge on the common poor fund; and when Mr. Goschen’s Act was passed and the arrangement was made as regards the payment at the rate of 5d. per head per day for inmates of workhouses, provision was made to the effect that no children under the age of 16 should be included in the calculation of the number of inmates of the workhouse. So that the guardians in London have always had the greatest possible interest in getting the children out of the workhouses; and as a fact you would not find any children in any of the London workhouses except those who are too young to be sent to school, or those who from illness are not in a fit condition to be sent to school.

48. Chairman.] The effect then is this: that with regard to paupers in workhouses other than children, the amount is limited to 5d. a day?
Yes.

49. But with regard to the children, the whole amount, whatever it is, comes out of the common fund?
Yes, provided they are not in the workhouse; in that case no payment is made from the fund at all.

(70.)

50. Lord
50. Lord Baljoun of Earley.] And are you satisfied with the results of training the children in these separate establishments?

I may say that these schools are built usually in the outskirts of London, where land can be purchased at a comparatively small cost. There are, for instance, schools situated at Leavesden, Pinner, Mitcham, Norwood, Southall, Harold Court, Edmonton, Sutton, Anerley, Ashford, and Banstead. The majority of these schools provide for from about 250 to 600 children, but there are three which have accommodation for a much larger number. As to the education of the children, I think there can be no doubt that those who have remained in the school for a considerable time are equal in intelligence and intellectual knowledge to the children trained in the public elementary schools of the metropolis. This may be accounted for to some extent by the regularity of the attendance of the children; then further, the teachers and the children are examined from time to time by the inspectors of the Board, and according to the result of the examination a certificate of a certain class is awarded to the teacher. Then there is a Parliamentary Grant in aid of the salaries of the teachers. If the sum which is payable to the guardians under the certificate which the teacher obtains is in excess of the salary which the guardians have arranged to pay to the teacher, the teacher is entitled to the difference by way of a bonus, and the result is, that there is a considerable incentive to the teacher to secure good reports from the inspector, and consequently an increased amount from the grant in excess of the salary which he receives. The elder children are practically half-timers, and, as a rule, nearly half the day is devoted to industrial work; for the girls, needle mistresses and instructors in cooking and in laundry work are employed; and for the boys, instruction is given in farming and other work on the land, carpentering, tailoring, shoe-making, engineers' work, baking, and so on. In all the large schools there are band-masters and drill-masters, and in some, swimming instructors. The training in instrumental music is an important feature, and a considerable number of the boys are enlisted each year into the regimental bands.

As regards the question as to the success of the children in after life, there seems to be no doubt at all that the boys especially have done well; with respect to the girls, there is some drawback when they are massed together in large institutions. It is clearly an advantage that they should be individualised, and that those entrusted with their care should take a personal interest in them, and exercise a personal influence over them. When you come to the very large establishments, there is the fact that the lighting is probably by gas; a great deal of the laundry work is done by machinery; much of the cooking is done by stoves; and the surroundings are very different from those of the household in which a girl on leaving would be likely to be placed. But the drawbacks in the case of very large schools are recognised, and there is no doubt that in future the disposition will be to establish schools more on the cottage home principle. One already has been established; another is now being provided. The plan is to have a central school which the children attend, and this is surrounded by separate dwellings, each one under the care of a foster parent, and there are from 20 to 25 or 30 children placed in each. But, notwithstanding the drawbacks which I have mentioned with regard to girls, the results can hardly be regarded, I think, as unsatisfactory. I should mention that nearly all the boards of guardians subscribe to an association for befriending young servants; and this association has undertaken the duty of visiting the girls who are sent out from the schools, and in a recent report they stated that the association had had under their supervision during the year 1,851 girls in service. Of this number 141 were from an industrial school, and six from the Royal Patriotic Schools, the remaining 1,704 were from London pauper schools. The report as to these girls shows that 1,358 were returned as "very good," or "fairly good." Against those returned as "fairly good," it is said that no serious faults were alleged; 183 were returned as "unsatisfactory;" these were accused of serious faults, such as petty dishonesty, untruth, violence of temper, and so on; and 37, or about two in the hundred, were returned as "bad," including those who had lost character, or who had been imprisoned for theft. The remaining number were accounted for by their having emigrated, married, or
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or died. Of course, in connection with any statement as to the after life of girls who have been brought up in these schools, it is right to bear in mind how very often there is a tendency on the part of disreputable relatives to drag them down, and that very often the situations that they get are in small households, where the position of the servant is frequently a very trying one; and then in many cases they suffer from physical defects, hereditary defects. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, and the fact that many of the girls are only for a comparatively short time in the schools, the results, as shown by the report referred to, cannot, I think, be regarded as other than satisfactory.

51. Earl of Milltown.] Do you mean to say that they suffer more from hereditary complaints than other girls?

I think there is no doubt that that is the case. There is especially a scrofulous tendency, and the managers of two of the schools have set up establishments, one at Herne Bay and another which I think is at Broadstairs, to which such children can be sent. And then there are a great many who are weak-minded; I mean stupid, not imbecile.

52. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Many of the children who go to these pauper schools are orphans, are they not?

Yes, there is a considerable proportion of orphans.

53. Have you any idea of the proportion of those who have either one or both parents dead?

No, we have no statistics which would give those particulars.

54. Now to pass to the subject of the casual poor; their relief is regulated by a different set of Acts, is it not?

Yes.

55. And by regulations issued under those Acts by the Local Government Board?

Yes. The first Act was passed in 1871, and the second in 1882.

56. Perhaps it would be convenient if you were now to state the provisions which regulate the admission of casual paupers to the casual wards?

The regulations which now apply to the relief of the casual poor are dated the 18th December 1882. They are regulations which apply to the country generally. A casual pauper is not to be admitted into a casual ward except upon an order signed by a relieving officer or an assistant relieving officer, or in cases of sudden and urgent necessity, by an overseer. But then the order provides that the master of the workhouse, or the superintendent of the casual ward, shall admit any casual pauper without an order where the case appears to be one of sudden or urgent necessity. When an order is given it is to show the hour and place at which it was given; and the order is available only on the day on which it is issued. The order is not to be available for admission earlier than 4 o'clock in the afternoon during the months between October and March, or earlier than 6 o'clock in the afternoon during the months between April and September; nor unless it is presented within a reasonable time after it has been obtained, unless where the case happens to be one of sudden or urgent necessity.

57. What is the effect of the regulations regarding the detention of casual paupers?

First, perhaps it would be convenient that I should say, that for the purposes of the metropolis the whole of London is regarded as one union under the Act.

58. Earl of Milltown.] What Act?

Both Acts, the Pauper Inmates Discharge and Regulation Act, 1871, and the Casual Poor Act, 1882. A casual pauper is not entitled to discharge himself before 9 o'clock in the morning of the second day following his admission, nor before he has performed the work prescribed for him; and where a casual pauper has been admitted on more than one occasion during one month into any
any casual ward of the same union, he is not entitled to discharge himself before 9 o'clock in the morning of the fourth day after his admission; and in computing the number of days during which the pauper may be detained Sunday is not included. But the order provides that the guardians may give any directions to the master of the workhouse, or to the superintendent of the casual ward, with respect to the discharge of any class or classes of casual paupers, before the expiration of the periods mentioned in the section; and independently of any direction given by the guardians as to classes, the master of the workhouse, or the superintendent of the casual ward, may, if in his opinion there are any special circumstances which require that a casual pauper should be discharged earlier than the expiration of the time specified, discharge him accordingly, but he is to report the facts of the case to the guardians at their next meeting.

50. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Have you any means of knowing how far those relaxing provisions are put in force?

I have no doubt that to a considerable extent the provision as regards the discharge at 9 o'clock in the morning is relaxed. The Board some time since had their attention called to the fact, that when a casual pauper was detained until that time, it was often extremely difficult for him to get work during the day, and that it would be a boon, if a man were really disposed to find work if he could, that he should be able to leave at an earlier hour; and the Board recommended by circular letter that in such cases the regulation as to the time of discharge should not be enforced. As regards the detention of persons who have been relieved in London casual wards on more than one occasion during one month, I may say that the Board have officers who visit nightly these casual wards, that they very soon get to know the habitual casuals, and that they identify the men. They take each night a record of the names of the persons they find in the wards, and they inform the superintendents of the casual wards as to the persons liable to detention, and can give evidence, if necessary, as to the cases where, under the order and Statute, the men may be detained. I may say that the officers meet each day and compare their lists, so that they get to know, as regards the regular attendants at casual wards, the wards in different parts of London to which they have been admitted on particular nights.

60. Earl of Hopetown.] Is there anything to prevent their giving a false name?

There is a penalty under the Statute for giving a false name; and I am told by the officers that it would be useless for them to do so, because they are well known.

61. Chairman.] What is the period of detention?

The maximum period of detention is until the morning of the second day after admission, except when a man has been relieved previously in the month, in which case he may be detained until the morning of the fourth day, Sunday not being counted.

62. That is, if he has been in other casual wards during the month?

Yes.

63. There can be no longer detention than that in the case of a man who has been in other casual wards in the same month?

There can be no detention in casual wards beyond the fourth day after admission, even in cases of men who are known to be habitually frequenting the casual wards.

64. Earl of Milltown.] There are a class of men who are habitual casuals?

Yes, who are well known to the officers who visit the wards.

65. Are they very numerous?

There is a fair proportion of them.

66. Lord
66. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Can you give any idea of the extent of the accommodation which has been provided in the metropolis for this class of paupers?

There are now beds for about 1,200 men and 500 women and children, making a total of 1,700.

67. And what proportion does the number of casual paupers ordinarily occupying any accommodation bear to the accommodation provided?

The number is about 1,200.

68. There was a special pressure, however, in the autumn of last year, was there not, on the wards in the central district, especially in the neighbourhood of Trafalgar-square?

Yes; in the summer a number of persons congregated in Trafalgar-square at night and slept on the seats and on the stones, and this went on until the colder weather came, when there was a good deal of sympathy shown by persons passing by, and some kind-hearted persons took to providing hot coffee for those who were there, and many gave money. The result was, that in no very long time there was a large accumulation of casuals in that neighbourhood. The police regarded the congregation of these people in this way as so serious a nuisance that they cleared the square. Then there was very great pressure upon the wards in the immediate neighbourhood, a pressure that the wards were quite unable to bear; not that the total number of casuals in London was increased, the number, I mean, actually requiring accommodation in casual wards, but there was this congestion in one particular district. Then the Strand guardians, to whom a large number were referred, took to giving relief by way of orders for common lodging-houses. The result was that they gave away as many as 500 orders in a night, for when it became known that by applying to the relieving officer of the Strand Union a man would get an order for a common lodging-house for the night, and be saved putting his hand into his pocket for a lodging, there was a considerable increase in the applications. Temporarily the guardians, with a view of lessening the pressure of some of the wards, did not detain the casual paupers for the period that they might have done.

69. Earl of Milltown.] They had no power to act in that way, had they?

They are empowered by the order, as regards any class or classes, to dispense with compliance. The Strand guardians also acquired premises for the purpose of a vagrant ward, and they were able after a time to give orders for admission to their own ward instead of orders for admission to the common lodging-houses, and that further checked the applications. But there has been, ever since, more pressure in the central district than there had been previously. Whilst there was this pressure in the wards of that district, in the parishes on the outskirts there was no special demand, but in fact vacant accommodation.

70. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Does that pressure continue up to the present time?

It has continued to some extent, but only to a very slight extent as compared with what it was; and I think it is a great deal attributable to the fact that the guardians have not in all cases as yet relinquished the plan of not detaining the casuals for the full time.

71. Earl of Milltown.] Did that congestion in the Strand District tend to alleviate the applications in the outside district?

Yes. During the time that this great pressure was going on, in Islington, where accommodation is provided for 76 persons, 39 was the largest number on any one night, and 28 the average number; in Lambeth, where there is accommodation for 78, the largest number was 42, and the average number 31; while in St. Pancras, Rotherhithe, Mile End, Paddington, and the majority of the other parishes and unions, a considerable margin of accommodation remained available.

72. That shows that the total number of casuals remained pretty much the same?

(70.)

Yes
Yes, if you exclude those who had the tickets for common lodging-houses. It became a difficulty to find common lodging-houses where they could be taken in within any reasonable distance from Trafalgar-square.

73. Lord Balfour of Burley. There is a special Act, is there not, which enables the Local Government Board to certify schools for the reception of pauper children, and those schools are partly supported by voluntary aid?
Yes; it is an Act passed in 1862, the 25th and 26th Victoria, chapter 43.

74. Is that taken advantage of by the metropolitan guardians?
To a very considerable extent; and especially with regard to the Roman Catholic children. I think I may say that the guardians of all the metropolitan unions now hand over to the Roman Catholics in connection with their certified schools the Roman Catholic children in the different schools and workhouses.

75. And some go, do they not, to special institutions for special classes, such as those who are deaf and dumb, those who are blind, those who are idiots, or those who, from any cause, cannot be properly dealt with in your large pauper schools?
Yes. The number in certified schools from the metropolis on the 1st of January last was 2,162, that number including the children in the Roman Catholic certified schools. There are certified schools also which have been provided for giving industrial training, and to these a certain number of children are sent by the guardians as well as to schools for deaf and dumb, and blind, and other classes.

76. The question of boarding-out pauper children has been raised; can you give the Committee any information as to the arrangements which are made in regard to the establishment of Boarding-out Committees outside the limits of the union?
The arrangements with regard to boarding-out are provided for by an Order dated the 25th of November 1870: under that order a Boarding-out Committee may be constituted. The names of those proposing to form the committee are sent to the Local Government Board, and when the constitution of the committee has been approved by them, the committee are in a position to take charge of children from any union that may propose to send children to them.

77. Chairman. Does that apply to the Metropolis only?
No; it applies to a large proportion of the unions, all the very populous unions throughout the country. The boarding-out is subject to certain conditions; the first is, that "no child shall be so boarded out unless such child is an orphan, or, being illegitimate, deserted by the mother, or, being legitimate, deserted by both parents, or deserted by one parent, the other parent being dead or under sentence of penal servitude, or suffering permanently from mental disease, or out of England." The second is, that "no child shall be first boarded out at an earlier age than two, or at a later age than 10 years." A certificate is to be given by the medical officer of the union or parish as to the health of the child before the child is sent to a Boarding-out Committee. Not more than two children, save only in the case of brothers and sisters, are to be boarded out in the same home at the same time, and in no case is the number of children boarded out in the same house to exceed four. No child is to be boarded out with a foster parent of a different religious persuasion from that to which the child belongs. "Before receiving any child to be boarded out with them, the foster-parents shall sign an undertaking in duplicate, which shall, in addition to any other matter which may be agreed upon, contain an engagement on the part of the foster-parents that in consideration of their receiving a certain sum per week, they will bring up the child as one of their own children, and provide it with proper food, lodging, and washing, and endeavour to train it in habits of truthfulness, obedience, personal cleanliness, and industry, as well as in suitable domestic and out-door work; that they will take care that the child shall attend duly at church or chapel according to the religion to which the child belongs, and shall, while boarded out, between the ages of 4 and 12 years, attend a school, unless prevented by sickness or other urgent cause, during all the usual hours for instruction thereat; that they will provide for the proper repair and renewal
renewal of the child’s clothing, where an allowance is made by the guardians for that purpose, and that in case of the child’s illness they will report it to the guardians, and also to the Boarding-out Committee, and that they will at all times permit the child to be visited by any member of the Boarding-out Committee, and by any person specially appointed for that purpose by the guardians or by the Local Government Board. Then, no child is to be boarded-out except within a certain distance from a school, the schoolmaster of which is willing to send to the guardians a report upon the child at least once a quarter, nor is a child to be boarded-out in any home which is distant more than five miles by the nearest road of access from the residence of some member of the committee. Every boarded-out child is to be visited not less often than once in every six weeks, at the home of the foster parents, by a member of the committee; the visitor is to make a report in writing to the committee, and these reports are to be forwarded by the committee to the guardians, not less often than quarterly.

78. Earl of Milltown.] Is there any penalty on the foster-parent for breaking any of those conditions?
No pecuniary penalty; the penalty would be the withdrawal of the child. If the report of the member of the committee who visited the child was so unfavourable as to require it, the child would be withdrawn.

79. Supposing the report was that some of the conditions had not been complied with, would there be any result from that?
Yes; if the report was clearly so unsatisfactory as to make it inexpedient in the opinion of the guardians that the child should remain there, they would withdraw the child.

80. Chairman.] The guardians have an absolute discretion in the matter of withdrawal, have they not?
Yes, they have; and there is also a power vested in the Board of withdrawing the certificate of the committee; and in that case the children must be returned.

81. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have any cases of that sort come before the Board; have the Board had to take action in that direction?
There have hardly been any cases where certificates have been withdrawn.

82. Lord Balfour of Burley.] What is the maximum rate of charge for children so boarded out?
The Order provides that “in no case shall the weekly sum to be paid by the guardians to the foster-parent for the maintenance of a child, inclusive of lodging, but exclusive of clothing, school-pence, and fees for medical attendance, exceed 4 s.”

83. What is the general and regular charge; does it come up to the maximum?
Yes, generally it is so. In addition to the weekly payment, the guardians pay school fees, and make an allowance for clothing, and some small amount for medical attendance.

84. Earl of Milltown.] I suppose it varies with the age of the child, to some extent?
Not much.

85. Earl of Onslow.] What would be the average cost?
I should think from 4 s. to 5 s., less than that in some cases.

86. Chairman.] How would that compare with the expense of a child at one of the schools connected with the board of guardians?
It would be somewhat less, but not materially less.

87. Which would be less?
I should think that the cost in the workhouse school would be somewhat less in rural districts, but not much less.
88. The difference would not be large?
No.

89. Earl of Aberdeen. It would not be below 3s. 6d. on an average, even in a workhouse, would it?
In connection with the workhouse, you have not only to take the cost of the maintenance, but the provision of the building, the salaries of officers, and other items.

90. Lord Balfour of Burley. Have the guardians in the metropolitan union availed themselves much of their powers in this matter of boarding out?
There are about 650 children boarded out from the London unions.

91. Earl of Onslow. Out of a total number of how many?
I think about 1,300 is the total number of children boarded out under committees.

92. Lord Balfour of Burley. Are they spread over all the unions, or does one union avail itself more than others of this power?
Some unions board out much more than others, some not at all.

93. In addition to the safeguards you have mentioned, I believe you have a lady who has been appointed as inspector, who visits children?
Yes; Miss Mason has for the last two years or more been visiting children boarded out with boarding-out committees in different parts of the country.

94. What is the effect of her reports?
I think that, on the whole, her reports must be regarded as showing that the system is working very satisfactorily; but, at the same time, they afford evidence that there is great necessity for care on the part of the boarding-out committees, not only in the selection of the homes in the first instance, but in the supervision of the children afterwards.

95. To what causes do you attribute the indisposition of some boards of guardians to avail themselves of this power of boarding out?
I think it would probably arise from the fact, that they are perfectly well satisfied with the arrangements of their own schools. They see that the children are getting out into life fairly well, and they see no particular reason for handing the care of the children over to other persons.

96. Is the cost of boarding-out pauper children a charge upon the Common Poor Fund of the Metropolis, in the same way as the cost of the maintenance of the children in the separate pauper schools is?
Yes; so that there is no consideration of that kind to check the sending of children to boarding-out committees; the cost of their maintenance is borne by the fund in the same way as that of the children in the separate schools.

97. There is another important power entrusted to the guardians which we have not touched upon yet, that is in the matter of emigration; will you state the regulations made by the authority of the Local Government Board for assisting in the emigration of poor persons?
There are no special regulations on that subject; there are statutory provisions. I am speaking now with reference to the emigration of adult persons.

98. I believe, unlike those other matters with which we have been dealing, the power to emigrate poor persons is not limited to those who are actually chargeable on the rates at the time?
That is the case; the guardians can assist to emigrate any poor person, subject to the sanction of the Local Government Board.

99. Has this power been exercised of recent years to any considerable extent?
It has been exercised with regard to the emigration of children to Canada considerably, but not as regards the emigration of adults. Including the children who were sent to Canada, the total number assisted out of the rates to emigrate during the last year was 711.
100. Can you give us some idea of the conditions under which the Local Government Board authorise expenditure by guardians in the emigration of children to Canada?

They have laid down certain conditions with respect to the emigration of orphan and deserted children to Canada. They require, in the first place, that the person taking out the child shall give an undertaking that he will furnish the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa with a statement as to the name and age of the child, and the name and the address of the person with whom the child is to be placed, with a view to its being visited by one of the officers of the Canadian Government. A copy of this statement is to be furnished to the guardians and also to the Local Government Board. The person proposed to be entrusted by the guardians with the emigration of a child is to have notice from the guardians whether the child is a Protestant or a Roman Catholic; and he is to give an undertaking, if the child is a Protestant, that he shall be placed with a family of the Protestant faith, or if the child is a Roman Catholic that he shall be placed in a Roman Catholic home. It is required that a child, before being sent to Canada, shall have been under previous instruction at least six months in a workhouse or separate school under the guardians, or a district school, or in a school certified by the Board; and further, the guardians must have such evidence as they deem satisfactory that the person taking out the children has a reasonable prospect of finding suitable homes for them in Canada. The Board advise that as a general rule girls should not be sent out above the age of 10 years, and in no case, except under very special circumstances, above the age of 12 years.

101. For some time, I think, the Local Government Board withheld their consent to the emigration till reports which were expected from the Canadian Government came to hand?

Yes, the Canadian Government had undertaken that the children should be visited, but there was a considerable interval during which these reports were not received by the Board; and the Board considered that, having regard to the future of these children, children who were orphans or deserted, and had no one specially interested in them, it was desirable that there should be some official report as to the condition of the children and of the homes in which they had been placed; and, pending the receipt of those reports, for a time the Board withheld their sanction to the sending out of children.

102. The reports are now in their possession, are they not?

Reports have been received, and they are of a satisfactory character; and a considerable number of children have been sent out. Last year 411 children, taking the whole of England and Wales, were sent to Canada at the cost of the rates.

103. Earl of Onslow.] Are those reports presented to Parliament?

They are included in an Appendix to the Annual Report of the Board; there is a separate report as regards each child.

104. Lord Balfour of Burley.] In the metropolitan district a large number of the items of expenditure of the guardians are a charge upon the different unions in proportion to their rateable value, are they not, and are distributed by means of the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund?

Yes, The Common Poor Fund was established in 1867. Under the Metropolitan Poor Acts the charges which are cast upon this fund are, those for maintenance of lunatic and insane poor, maintenance of paupers suffering from fever or small-pox, cost of medicine and medical and surgical appliances, salaries of officers, rations of officers, compensation for loss of office, registration fees, vaccination fees and expenses, maintenance of pauper children, expenses of the casual poor, maintenance of in-door paupers to the extent of 5d. per head per day, education of out-door pauper children, and expenses of ambulances. In respect of the year ended at Lady-day 1886 the total sum received from the fund by the metropolitan unions and parishes amounted to 217,000l. All the expenditure under the different heads that I have referred to is made a charge upon this common fund to which all the unions and parishes contribute in the proportion of their rateable value. (70.)
The net sum received by the poorer parishes, practically from the richer ones, during the year 1886 amounted, as I have said, to 217,000l. The total expenditure cast upon the fund in respect of the year ended at Lady-day 1886 was 929,000l. Some of the richer unions contribute very largely. The City of London, for instance, contributed as their net contribution, 73,000l.; St. George's contributed 33,000l., and Kensingston 19,000l. Whilst taking some of the poorer districts, Holborn received in respect of the year 27,000l., St. Saviour's 23,000l., and Bethnal Green 20,000l. So that the result of the Common Poor Fund is considerably to diminish the burden which previously fell upon the poorer districts.

105. Very shortly, now with regard to the arrangements as to relief outside the Metropolis; the order which you mentioned with regard to the administration of out-door relief in the case of able-bodied men out of work is also in force, is it not, in the principal manufacturing centres in Lancashire and Yorkshire as well as in London?

Yes, in nearly all of the very populous unions of a manufacturing character, and in all the unions in London, the regulations I referred to are in force.

106. In a large number of unions they are under a different class of regulations?

Yes, under an Order that was issued in 1844.

107. Chairman. I understood you to say that the Orders that you have described to us as applicable to the Metropolis, are in fact applied to all the larger populous places?

Yes.

108. Now will you kindly state the difference between those Orders and those applicable to the rest of the country?

The most important point is that in those cases where an able-bodied male person could, under the Order that I referred to, be relieved by out-door relief, subject to a labour-test, the Order of 1844 requires that the relief shall be given in the workhouse. This is, of course, subject to exceptions in cases of sudden and urgent necessity, and where relief is required on account of sickness or death of a member of the family, and so on. Able-bodied men who seek relief by reason of their being out of work in London may be relieved, subject to a labour-test, out of the workhouse, while under this Order they ought to be admitted into the workhouse.

109. Are there no provisions under the Order you are mentioning which enable the guardians to establish any system of relieving able-bodied paupers under the sanction of a labour-test?

No, not under this Order; but there is a provision somewhat similar to that in the Order I first referred to, which enables the guardians, subject to the sanction of the Board, to make exceptions in particular cases.

110. Lord Balfour of Burley.] That is if there was any considerable pressure in consequence of a general scarcity of work, or any emergency, and it was thought necessary to do it?

Yes, and whenever there are any very special circumstances of the character referred to, the Board, on the application of the guardians supplement this Order by another Order called the Out-door Labour Test Order, practically putting in force a provision similar to that in the Order applicable to the Metropolis.

111. Chairman. That would only be in very special circumstances, and would be withdrawn, I apprehend, as soon as those special circumstances ceased to exist?

When we have once issued the Order we do not usually withdraw it, but the guardians do not act upon it when the emergency ceases.

112. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Perhaps you would give us the particulars, according
according to the most recent returns, of the number of paupers relieved in England and Wales, exclusive of lunatics in asylums, and vagrants?

According to the latest return, which is for the month of January, the number of paupers in England and Wales, on the last day of the last week of that month, was 778,111.

113. Can you give the Committee similar information over two or three years?
Yes; I have a statement which gives the number relieved in each year since 1857.

114. How do the numbers for 1888 compare with those for 1886 and 1887?
The number in 1886 was 770,570; in 1887 it was 778,961; and in 1888 it was 778,111; a slight diminution.

115. Chairman.] What are the respective percentages on the estimated population?
In 1886, 28 per cent.; in 1887, 27·9 per cent.; and in 1888, 27·5 per cent.

116. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Can you give 1867 and 1868?
In 1867 the proportion was 47·8 per cent.

117. What would be the gross number in 1888, if they bore the same ratio to population as in 1868?
If in 1888 the number of paupers bore the same relation to population as in 1868, the number would be 1,358,000 instead of 778,000.

118. Earl of Milltown.] It is only half what it would be if the average had been kept up?
Yes, not much more.

119. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Have the Local Government Board had occasion to consider the question, with regard to assistance from benefit and other clubs in connection with Poor Law relief?
Questions have from time to time been referred to the Board on that subject, and a letter was written on the 5th of January 1870, which has been used from time to time, in which the Board’s views on the subject are rather fully set out. (The letter is handed in.)

120. Has it been considered that, in determining the amount of relief to be given to a person, the assistance that he might receive from any such society should be taken into account in determining the amount to be given by the guardians?
The view taken by the Board was this: that the duty of the guardians is to relieve destitution; and that the guardians, in strictness, ought to take into consideration any income of the person, from whatever source it came, in determining what amount they ought to give by way of relief.

121. In strictness, you do not quite carry that out, do you?
I have no doubt that the guardians, in many cases, if they do not exclude from consideration the sums received, take into account only a proportion of the amount received from the club.

122. Chairman.] Is that not a very general practice, so far as you know?
I rather think it is.

123. Lord Balfour of Burley.] It would not be fair, would it, to say that a man who had, by subscribing to a benefit society, made a provision for old age or sickness, should be more strictly dealt with than one who had made no such provision, by being forced into the workhouse, as far as any pressure which the guardians could put upon him could force him into it?
It would not be so much the forcing into the workhouse, but determining what the amount of the relief should be that should be given in the particular case.

124. Chairman.] Is it not the case that in many unions it is applied as a kind of test whether it is out-door or in-door relief that is to be given; I mean that, where the applicant is in a benefit club there is much more disposition to give (70.) C 2 out-door
out-door relief, if it is desirable in the opinion of the guardians, to supplement the amount he has, than if the applicant has never been in a benefit club?

No doubt that is so, and reasonably so. I may perhaps read the concluding paragraph from the letter to which I have referred: "In the opinion of the Board, it would not be expedient to administer poor rates, which are levied from all classes down to those on the very verge of destitution, in such a manner as to cause them to be recognized by the working classes of the country as a provision substituted by the law of the land for that which, in the absence of such a system, they would be willing to provide for themselves and their families through the medium of benefit societies. The Board regard the prosperity and extension of these benefit societies as a matter of extreme importance, and would be anxious to encourage their establishment by all legitimate means. But the Board, as at present advised, believe that this encouragement could not safely be given by allowing the poor rates to be treated as a subsidiary fund. The Board cannot shut their eyes to the fact, that the only safe basis on which the system of benefit societies can rest, under the present system of the legal right to relief is, that they afford the means of providing, in times of distress or disability, a more eligible, respectable, and liberal maintenance than that supplied under the Poor Law, and that they should be still regarded as a mode for avoiding the degradation of parish support, rather than as conferring a title by which a claim to such support may be established even beyond the line of actual destitution."

125. When was that Order issued?
It was a letter addressed to Mr. (now Sir Richard) Paget in 1870.

126. But that principle would not, I apprehend, apply where the amount received from the benefit club was manifestly insufficient to support the family. Suppose, for example, that a man had seven children and his wife to support, and he received 6s. a week from a benefit club, he could not support them on that?
No.

127. In that case would it not be the duty of the guardians to give such further relief as his case might require?
I think clearly so. That letter rather dealt with this question. There are two persons whose circumstances are precisely similar; one has 3s. a week from a club, and the other has nothing; to meet the necessities of each, an income, we will say, of 10s. is required. Are the guardians to give to the man who has 3s. from the club 7s. only, which will be sufficient to make up with the 3s. the sum required for his necessities; or should he, as in the case of the man who has nothing from the club, receive 10s. from the guardians.

128. Lord Balfour of Burley.] As I understand, the way it is practically often solved is this: that the guardians take one-half of the amount got from the club and give that to the good of the man who has provided for himself; so that taking the figures you have given, the man in the club would probably get 11s. 6d. a week as a total, and the other man just the 10s.?
Yes, that is a very frequent practice.

129. Now, there is a difference, undoubtedly, in the practice of boards of guardians as to the extent to which the workhouse test shall be applied, and there is considerable variation too in the amount of the relief which in different unions might be given to persons under somewhat similar circumstances; have you any facts that you wish to put before us on that subject?
There is undoubtedly a very considerable difference in London as regards the practice adopted by different boards of guardians as to granting outdoor relief; there are some cases where scarcely any out-door relief is given, whilst there are other unions where a considerable amount is given.

130. Do you think it possible, or right, that an attempt should be made to frame rules by your Board which should provide more definitely for the action of
of the boards of guardians as to the amounts of the relief to be given by
them, or do you think that the guardians, acting as the representatives of
the ratepayers, should be left to act upon their own discretion in these matters, so
long as they conform to the general regulations which you lay down?

I think it would be difficult for the Board to go much further than they have
done as regards regulations. It devolves upon the Board to lay down the
general principles which they consider essential, leaving the guardians, as the
representatives of the ratepayers, to deal with each individual case, subject
to those regulations, as it arises. I do not think it can be said that it is satisfac-
tory that you should have in adjoining districts such a marked difference in
practice as you sometimes have now.

131. In many cases out-door relief might, with advantage to all parties,
might it not, be diminished to a greater extent than has been the case up to the
present time?

I would not say that there is the same scope for diminution of out-door relief
in London as in many of the unions in the provinces. I think there has been
an influence at work as regards London which has checked very considerably
the out-door relief, as the returns show. In some unions in the provinces there
is a strict administration; but those cases are somewhat exceptional cases, and
I think that in many unions out-relief is given too freely. In some cases that is
attributable to the fact that there is a pressure for workhouse accommodation.

132. Earl of Onslow.] Is the 5d. per head per day which is given towards
maintenance of in-door paupers one of the principal causes of the diminution of
out-door relief and the increase of in-door relief?

There is the fact that the 5d. per head per day is paid, and the fact that the
metropolis stands higher than any other part of the country in the comparison
between out-door and in-door relief.

133. Chairman.] With respect to the labour test, is the nature of that test
entirely within the discretion of the guardians?

They report their resolution as to the task that they propose to the Board, and
it is approved by them.

134. Can you tell us what labour test usually is applied?

They vary very considerably. I am afraid I could not accurately state what
they are, but Mr. Hedley, the Inspector for the Metropolitan District, who I
understand is to be called as a witness, can give the information.

135. Taking your answer that there is a very considerable variety, is not it a
serious evil that there should be so much difference in the treatment of able-
bodied men having relief in different parts of London?

It is a drawback, no doubt.

136. On the point of the labour test, is it not possible to establish a system
which, if not absolutely uniform, would be a system which would be so nearly
one of equivalence, that there would be no inducement to a man to prefer one
place to another?

As it is, a man has hardly a choice; he has to apply for relief where he has
resided; and whatever may be the task enforced in that district he has to sub-
mitt to it.

137. My point was whether it was desirable to establish some uniformity in
practice?

There is no doubt that it would be exceedingly desirable to secure greater
uniformity than there is now, but it would be extremely difficult to force it upon
the guardians. The best mode of securing some approach to uniformity, I think,
would be the convening of a conference of delegates from the different boards of
 guardians in London to prepare a scheme. How far that would succeed it is
difficult to say.

138. You stated that there was very considerable difference in various unions
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in London in the practice of giving out-door relief; that in some much more out-door relief is given than in others?

Yes.

139. Is not so wide a difference in practice one which must give rise to a great deal of discontent and a feeling of inequality of treatment amongst the population who have to take advantage of the Poor Law?

I think that the facts are not very generally known, but there would be ground for that dissatisfaction if the facts were known.

140. As a matter of fact, do you think that there has been much dissatisfaction, from anything you have heard?

No, I cannot say that we have any evidence in the Department of dissatisfaction on the part of the poor themselves. It is the case that the workhouse test is enforced in the Eastern district, in the case of three or four unions, perhaps more strictly than in any other part of London.

141. I think I understood you to say that you do not see your way on that point to bringing about more uniformity than at present; the present system of giving this bonus, if I may so call it, upon indoor relief, appears to be doing as much as is possible in that direction, you think?

I think so. I do not see how the Board could interfere and prohibit the guardians from giving out-door relief in all classes of cases.

142. Whilst you would no doubt agree with me in the opinion that it is most desirable, not only in the interest of the ratepayers, but also in the interest of the poor themselves, to restrict as much as possible out-door relief, do not you think that if there was a general enforcement or, at all events, a sudden enforcement of a strict administration of the law of out-door relief, it would give rise to a serious amount of discontent amongst the labouring classes?

In London we have the case of St. George's-in-the-East, where out-door relief has almost been discontinued, without any strong evidence of any such feeling as that to which you refer. The guardians have been regarding the diminution of the rates as a minor question, and have been adopting a strict administration in the belief that they are helping the poor themselves by inducing habits of forethought and prudence. I believe that in that parish they have been assisted by the Charity Organisation Society; there has been a line of charity behind the strict administration.

143. Is not that exactly what is desirable, that the Poor Law should not be so administered as to dry up charity, but that charity should supplement it?

I think it extremely desirable from every point of view. If charity would only do its work in the right way, it would facilitate the Poor Law in carrying out its system on strict principles. It might be better carried out if charity supplemented the work of the guardians.

144. The great vice of the administration of the old Poor Law was, was it not, that in point of fact it attempted to take the place of charity to a great extent and so destroyed the charity of private persons very largely?

To a considerable extent it was so; and the relief was given in aid of wages.

145. Would you agree with me that the clear line to draw is that the Poor Law should be confined to dealing with cases of actual pressing destitution; that everything beyond that should, as far as possible, be done by means of private charity?

Yes.

146. You told us that a certain number of schools in London are certified to receive pauper children; do you not think that that system might be further extended with advantage?

It is carried out to a considerable extent.

147. Because, although the large pauper schools may be ever so well managed, they are open to the objection that they are collections of pauper children?

Yes;
Yes; but the school is entirely separate from the workhouse; all association with the workhouse has been discontinued, and there is not the same stigma upon a child brought up in one of these schools that there would be in the case of a child brought up in a London workhouse.

148. To that extent, therefore, that objection has been removed? It is very considerably diminished.

149. Would there not still remain this objection: that for various reasons the children of the pauper class are below the standard of the children of the population generally, and therefore the association of children of that pauper class alone is in itself an evil?

I should have said that the standard would not be at all below that of children to be found in certified schools ordinarily. You have in the orphan and deserted children who are in the schools for a considerable time a good element; they have been under regular instruction, and under the influence of the teachers for a number of years, and they give a considerable tone to the school. The class of children who are the most prejudicial are those who only come in for very short periods whilst the father or the mother is in the workhouse.

150. You draw a very wide distinction between a workhouse school and one which may be a school in connection with the workhouse, but separated entirely from it?
A very wide distinction.

151. With regard to emigration assisted by the guardians, it has been confined in London, I understand, to children; should you regard it as desirable that boards of guardians, either in London or elsewhere, should undertake to send adults out of this country at the expense of the rates?

As regards the country a considerable number of suitable men for emigration might no doubt be found; and if there was a large decrease of employment in consequence of arable land being made grazing land, or other causes, it might be desirable that the guardians should avail themselves of the power. As regards London, the persons who become chargeable on the rates are very often men who physically are not of the type to be of very much service to a colony; but still, even as regards London, I think a good deal might be done in the way of assisting emigrants.

152. No doubt you are aware that the Colonies themselves would raise strong objections to any considerable emigration of paupers at the public expense from this country?
If it were done on a very large scale they certainly would.

153. But I was rather looking to the other aspects of the case; if it were to become a general practice to send able-bodied men abroad to the Colonies at the expense of the rates, would not the necessary result be that the void would always be filled up by the increase of population as fast as it was created; that, in point of fact, the gain would be ultimately nil?

All emigration, I am afraid, from England has but a temporary effect.

154. Would you not be disposed to limit the use of such powers to special cases arising from a congestion of the population, and regard it as a temporary expedient?
Yes, I think so.

155. To that extent it might be a power usefully used, and without danger?
Yes. Taking London, if the guardians were to a very considerable extent to assist in the emigration of persons, the places of those persons would probably very soon be taken up by immigrants into London.

156. Still there are cases where, by a sudden change in the course of trade, or other circumstances which could not be foreseen, there may arise a congestion of the population which it would be possible to relieve, and perhaps desirable to relieve in that way?

Yes;
Yes; but I think the way in which guardians very often regard it is this: The persons who are most suitable for emigration are people who are not very likely, although they are poor, to become chargeable on the rates; and unless the guardians see their way to some gain by the expenditure of the rates in aid of emigration, they are somewhat loth to move in the matter.

157. But the great objection is the one you have stated; if you convey away a considerable number of people from a great town like London, there will be a vacancy created which will be quickly filled up by the process of immigration into London?

Yes.

158. Has there been any considerable increase lately in the number of casual paupers in London?

No considerable increase.

159. Do you attribute that in any way to the law which now exists, enabling them to be detained for a time at the workhouse?

There has been a diminution since the passing of the Act of 1882.

160. But in the country generally I apprehend that lately there has been a considerable increase of vagrants?

I am not sure as to the numbers shown by the most recent Returns, but in the country it has not been the custom to enforce detention under the Act with anything like the strictness with which it is enforced in London.

161. Can you give us any opinion as to the effect of the enforcement of those regulations in the country where they have been enforced; do you know whether they have been found to be efficient?

I have no doubt that if you have three unions side by side, and in one they strictly enforce the detention, and in the other two they do not, the vagrants will find their way to the two unions where there is no detention.

162. You would be very much surprised to hear that some persons are of opinion that experience shows the reverse, and that in the rural unions vagrants rather prefer detention than otherwise?

There are cases no doubt where a man has been wandering about for some time, and has become tired out, and wants a day or two's rest. In such a case the man may prefer the detention; but as a rule the detention is not appreciated.

163. With regard to the children who are placed out in service, do they receive any assistance in money or clothes when they are placed out in service?

They would usually have an outfit of clothes, but would not be provided with money. The system of apprenticing which formerly existed has very much died out. When children were apprenticed a premium was paid, a certain portion on the child entering on the service, and the remainder at the expiration of a certain portion of the period of apprenticeship.

164. How soon generally are the girls placed out at service?

At about 14 or 15 years of age.

165. With regard to the boys, when do they generally go out?

About the same time.

166. Earl of Aberdeen.] In regard to the labour tests, does the Department look with favour or disfavour upon any particular system?

The labour test imposed by the guardians in the case of able-bodied men relieved on account of being out of work is usually that of stone-breaking or oakum picking; there is a very limited choice of tests.

167. Can the Board not take action with regard to getting provisions as to the test introduced, where it does not exist?

No; in a considerable number of unions at the present time, in the Metropolis, they have no labour test in force at all; they have not found it necessary.
With a limited number of cases of able-bodied applicants they have either offered the workhouse, or have applied for a dispensation from the requirement of the order as to a labour test.

168. Does not the existence or non-existence of the labour test depend rather upon the opinion of the guardians in respective unions, than upon the requirements of the district?

It depends entirely upon the guardians, but then it must be assumed, I think, that they form their opinion according to the requirements of the district at the particular time.

169. But is it not the case that in different unions in London, more or less of the same character as to population, in one instance there is a labour test, and in another not?

Yes, I have no doubt that that is the case.

170. Then with regard to the diminution in pauperism, according to the percentage per thousand of the population, you mentioned some of the causes for this change; may I ask if you consider that the diminution represents a corresponding diminution of poverty as distinguished from pauperism?

What I should say is this: that since the workhouse test has been more strictly applied than it was formerly, you have brought to bear upon the applicants for relief an influence which has the effect of inducing them to do everything they can before they apply for relief; and I think also that you would find that the relatives are much more willing to assist, when they are able to assist, if the question is as to whether a person should go into the workhouse or not. As a matter of fact, it is considered no disgrace at all, but rather an advantage, to have out-door relief; but to go into the workhouse is considered to bring discredit upon the members of the family; and whilst in the one case relatives will help, in the other they do not see the necessity for it.

171. Has the mode of administration led to a better understanding on the point, that dependence on relief from the rates, whether indoor or outdoor, is pauperism, and that one is to be avoided as much as the other?

I think that the disposition to receive out-door relief would be as great now as it ever was if the guardians would give it; but I think that the fact that an applicant for relief would only be offered admission to the workhouse has the effect of inducing persons to make every possible effort to avoid applying to the guardians at all, and to appeal to their relatives to help them to an extent that they would not have done if they could readily get out-door relief.

172. Then, as far as you know, is there any system prevailing as to meeting half-way the assistance of relatives, or have the guardians not attempted that to any large extent?

No, I am not aware of any such system. The guardians would give the applicant such relief as they consider necessary, and if they found that there were relatives who were in a position to maintain him, they could get an order from the justices requiring them to contribute towards the cost of the maintenance; but there is a great deal of difficulty in ascertaining the facts as to relatives, and especially as to their means; they are often residing in distant parts of the country. That relatives will come forward and help, when it is a question of the person going into the workhouse, much more readily than when it is a question of receiving out-door relief, I think there can be no doubt whatever.

173. Chairman. Where the relatives are willing to pay a portion of the cost, is it the practice, is it not, to accept that portion of the cost, if it is as much as they can afford, and to supplement it by payment from the rates?

Yes; that is to say, that the guardians would give a certain amount as relief, and they would take in repayment of a part of that relief such sum as the relatives could give.

(70.)
174. Such sum as the guardians thought sufficient, or as might be fixed by a magistrate, on application to a magistrate?
Yes.

175. Earl of Aberdeen.] Then we may take it that one of the chief advantages of the modern system has been that it has brought pressure to bear upon relatives and others who ought to contribute to the maintenance of persons in distress, to a different extent from what prevailed before?
Yes, and that it secures a person making every possible effort to keep free from relief from the rates before he will go to the guardians.

176. Referring to the marked improvement in connection with workhouses, especially in the infirmaries, as to nurses and so forth, are these improvements due partly to suggestions and instructions of the Board, or solely to the action of the guardians?
They are due very much, I think, to the Act which was passed in 1867, the Metropolitan Poor Act. One of the objections that the guardians used to offer when they were pressed to appoint certain officers was the expense; but that Act placed as a charge upon the common fund of the metropolis the whole cost of the salaries of officers, and that has very much diminished the disposition of guardians to make the appointments that are necessary.

177. Then as to the education of children, what are the general arrangements as to placing them (I am speaking now of boys) when they leave school, now that apprenticeship, as you have mentioned, is not very much adopted?
Applications are frequently made at schools, or at the workhouses, for children.

178. And, failing that, the guardians have to find places for them?
I do not think there is much practical difficulty in finding employment. I think in the Report of the Local Government Board of last year there was a statement showing the employment that were found for children.

179. You mentioned that the cottage system was being commenced in some cases; is it anticipated that there will be an increase of expense which may hinder that being rapidly adopted?
There is no doubt that in the case of the cottage homes that have been started the expense per head is somewhat greater than in the ordinary schools; but I think that the advantages of the cottage-home system is so much admitted that there would be a disposition to erect the schools on that system in future.

180. As to casual wards, is there any discrimination as to the treatment of various people who present themselves for admission; I mean the treatment accorded to a man evidently not an habitual resorter to such places, and as compared with regular vagrants?
No; he would have to undergo the bath; he would have the same meals, and the arrangements generally with regard to him would be the same. But in a large majority of the casual wards the arrangements are on the cellular system, so that each person has a separate sleeping compartment for himself, with his work-place adjoining. Although it is a great boon to the men of the character you were referring to to be separated from the ordinary occupants of a vagrant ward, yet it is rather distasteful to the regular vagrant, who would prefer association with others of the same class.

181. And that is on the increase?
Yes, the majority of the casual wards in London are now on that system, I have now the statement in the Report of the Local Government Board, as to the occupations of the children placed out from the metropolitan schools, if you would like to have the particulars. The statement is as to the children placed out from metropolitan schools during the year 1886; of the boys, 66 became bakers, 153 became members of naval or military bands, 43 entered domestic service, and 21 became hairdressers. Then there were 86 who went to working homes. These are very often boys who are employed as errand boys during the day, sleeping in these homes at night, and being allowed a certain portion of their earnings. The remaining numbers are as follows: mercantile marine,
marine, 52; shoemakers, 55; tailors, 45; other employments, 109; making a total of 708. Of the girls, 456 entered domestic service and 4 entered other occupations.

182. Then as to the boarding out of children; may we take it that while you recognise the general advantage of such a system, you would deprecate anything like a rapid increase of the system, or an attempt to increase the system rapidly, because of the dangers to which it is liable?

There has been every disposition on the part of the Board to encourage the boarding out of pauper children, but, as you suggest, the Board would think that it was inexpedient very largely all at once to increase the demand for these homes. The system if it works gradually is more likely to be successful than if there is a sudden and large demand for foster parents; whilst it is growing gradually there is greater opportunity of making a wise choice in the selection of foster parents, and upon that the success of the system must very much depend.

183. I understand that the actual carrying out or adoption of the system depends entirely upon the guardians:

It rests entirely with the guardians.

184. The Board recommend and encourage it?

But have no authority to order that children should be boarded out.

185. As to the emigration of children, could you tell us to what extent the Canadian Government undertake subsequent supervision?

They promised that, if they were furnished with lists of the children sent out by the guardians, they would from time to time, through the immigration officers or some other officers of the Dominion, visit and make a report on each of the children; and in the last Report of the Board will be found the reports which were received.

186. What was the number of children who went to Canada last year?

Four hundred and eleven. In 1886 it was 164.

187. So far as the experiment has gone, the Board are satisfied with the success of it, are they?

Yes; at the same time they are very strongly impressed with the importance of the guardians being very careful as to the arrangements that are made with regard to the emigration of children.

188. Have any complaints reached the Board as to any abuses in Canada, not with regard especially to children sent out from this country, but pauper children in Canada who have been supposed to be subjected to too much work?

No, I cannot say that I remember any communication specially bearing upon that question; I think I may say, from the information we have had, that there can be little doubt that the boys work fairly hard, and that often the life is somewhat harder and rougher than if they had remained in England.

189. To refer for one moment to the question of rates; is it your experience that a desire to reduce the rates tends to make the prevalence of outdoor relief unpopular?

No; I think that those who are working most in the direction of granting indoor relief are some of the ablest and best men that we have connected with boards of guardians, and men who, if it were merely a question of the pounds sterling that might be saved by the adoption of a strict system, would never have taken any special interest in the enforcement of that system. They are satisfied from their experience that laxity in the administration of outdoor relief is really an evil to the poor themselves.

190. That was exactly my impression; but I have been told that in some unions the granting of outdoor relief seems to be rather popular with the general body of ratepayers; is not that rather a strange circumstance considering that one would suppose that it would be their interest to get the rates reduced by checking the system of outdoor relief?
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It is very difficult to say what the views of individual ratepayers are, but there is not unfrequently grumbling as to the rates that they have to pay.

191. Do you think that any of the old abuse as to wages comes into the question as it affects the metropolis?

I think that when guardians give outdoor relief it is most exceptional to give relief that is really sufficient unless the person has some other means; they trust to the person eking out a living by getting employment or some assistance in some way or another; and to the extent to which a person who receives relief will work for lower wages than those ordinarily paid there is a tendency to reduce the rate of wages for services of that particular character.

192. Might I put a general question as to whether there are any points in connection with the administration of the Poor Law upon which you think special alterations are required?

I cannot suggest any general alterations that it appears to me would be an improvement; there is no doubt that of late years there has been a very marked change in the way, as I think, of an improvement in the administration.

193. You understand that I am asking you not as to the regulations and administration of the Local Government Board, but as to the practice in the different unions, where some pressure can be brought to bear by the Board?

Yes, I understand that to be the question.

194. Can you tell us whether the total cost of the maintaining of paupers in London has decreased or increased since the introduction of the system of paying 5 d. a head from the general rate for indoor paupers, and placing certain other expenses upon the general rate?

The expenditure in connection with relief has considerably increased, but you have to bear in mind the great improvements that have been made as regards the officers employed, the dispensaries that have been established, the infirmaries that have been erected, and other matters. The expenditure for these purposes has had its effect upon the total expenditure of the poor rate.

195. But might not that be the explanation of what was alluded to by Lord Aberdeen, that ratepayers to some extent are in favour of out-door relief; that they think that the present system, though admirable in some respects, is more expensive?

I am not aware that any such feeling exists; I can quite understand that a ratepayer interested in a particular person might say, "I should be glad if he had not been sent into the workhouse;" but he would be looking rather to the individual for whom he had some personal feeling than to the general question.

196. Earl of Milltown.] Do you not think that, irrespective of that, the ratepayer might possibly argue that it would be cheaper to give a small amount out of the workhouse than to keep the man in the workhouse?

Yes; that is a suggestion from time to time made; but then you have not only to consider the particular case, but you also have to consider how far the offer of the workhouse, in the one case, would deter a large number of others from applying.

197. Is not that suggestion to which I have referred one that probably arises in the mind of the ordinary ratepayer?

That is a suggestion not unfrequently made.

198. Earl of Onslow.] Can you give us the relative cost of keeping a pauper in the workhouse and the average of out-door relief?

In our last Annual Report we gave the cost per head on the mean number of paupers of all classes, and the amount was, 22 l. 5 s. 2 d. The cost per head on the mean number of out-door paupers only was 4 l. 16 s. 5 d.

199. Chairman.] Pursuing that subject, you are able, no doubt, to give us some returns which would show the total amount of the cost of pauperism for a series of years?

As regards the metropolis or the country generally?

200. The
200. The country generally; I mean the total cost and the percentage upon
the whole number of paupers in a given year; I think it is usually drawn out
in this form: the cost per head, and the cost per head of the total population;
it is a very important return to have if you can give it us?
We have returns for the 1st of January and the 1st of July in each year, and
our practice is to take the mean of the numbers shown by those two returns as the
number that may be assumed to have been in receipt of relief throughout the
year. We should have those numbers for a series of years, and also the expe-
diture in relief.

201. Will you give us such a return as that?
Yes.

202. Lord Balfour of Burley.] There is not, is there, in your own mind, the
slightest doubt as to the fact that, if out-door relief were to be more generally
given, it would be an enormously more expensive system than that at present
adopted?
I have no doubt whatever as to that.

203. The whole teaching of past experience shows that?
Yes.

204. Chairman.] But still, as a matter of fact, it seems that the result of
applying the workhouse test more strictly in London, combined with all the
other improvements that have been made, has been to increase the total cost?
Yes, but the combination of the improvements has had a most marked effect
as regards the increase of the cost. Take, for instance, all the expenses in con-
nection with the Metropolitan Asylums Board, with their asylums for imbeciles,
and for small-pox and fever cases, and then the cost of the infirmaries, and the
salaries of officers.

205. But I apprehend that you would not allow that the benefits of the
improved system are to be measured by the cost alone?
No.

206. You would agree that the advantages in encouraging thrift amongst the
poor generally, and discouraging a general application for relief would, in itself,
counterbalance any possible immediate increase which might take place from
the stricter administration of the workhouse test?
Yes, and it is not fair even in dealing with London to take the present pauperism
and see what the cost of that pauperism is as compared with what it was 10 or
15 years ago; you ought to take the cost of the pauperism that you might fairly
expect would exist at the present time if the stricter system had not been
adopted.

207. Lord Balfour of Burley.] That is, in fact, the ratio to the population?
Yes; but it is fairer to go out of London, in consequence of those disturbing
elements in the comparison in connection with the improvements to which I
have referred. In many country unions where the administration has been
strict you would find the result is a very clear gain pecuniarily. The inspectors
will have no difficulty in mentioning particular unions where there has been a
considerable saving of cost, without, as they would say, any hardship upon the
paupers.

208. Chairman.] And from the experience that has been had in London you
would be strongly in favour of any plan by which the system prevailing in
London could be practically extended to the rest of the country?
To a considerable extent.

209. Earl of Strafford.] You mentioned the name of a lady inspector, Miss
Mason; was she appointed to superintend and inspect children boarded out, or
does she perform the other duties of a poor law inspector?
Her duties are limited entirely to visiting the boarded-out children.

210. Does she take the metropolitan area or the country districts generally?
The whole of the country.

211. Does she make a report to your Board?
She makes a report upon the children boarded out by each boarding-out
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committee. Copies of those reports are sent by the Board to the guardians of the unions from which the children are sent, and in addition she makes a small report, which is published in our Annual Report.

212. How long has she been in her present position?
This is the third year.

213. Does she perform the same duties as the late Mrs. Nassau Senior performed so well?
No, the duties are not similar. Boarding-out had only just begun at the time Mrs. Nassau Senior was appointed. Her duties were chiefly with regard to visiting and reporting on the different schools, especially with reference to the girls.

214. I suppose I may take it for granted that you and your Board think it a very desirable thing to have such an inspection; that an educated gentlewoman is the best person for the inspection of the boarding-out system, because a lady would naturally have qualifications which a gentleman would not have?
The arrangement has been a tentative one, and the appointment has been renewed from time to time; it has recently been renewed for another year, but I think there can be no doubt that Miss Mason has discharged the duties in a very satisfactory manner, and that in many respects a lady would be better able to discharge the duties than a gentleman.

215. Has she a deputy inspector under her?
No; she visits personally the homes of the different children.

216. Earl of Milltown.] I suppose the value of the work done by the labour test bears an infinite-inval proportion to the amount of relief afforded?
A very small proportion; and sometimes I think the guardians can hardly sell the broken stone at a higher price than they have to pay for the stone.

217. Do I understand you to say that only two-thirds of the amount raised by the poor rate is expended in the relief of the poor; 3,168,000l. you said was raised, and 2,123,000l. of that only expended in the relief of the poor?
Yes; a third of the money is applied to other purposes.

218. Can you say what other purposes it goes to?
The expenditure, in addition to the expenditure for the relief of the poor, and purposes connected therewith, included payments to County and Police Rates, 748,000l.; to Highway Boards and Rural Sanitary Authorities, 326,000l.; to Burial Boards, 6,109l.; to School Boards, 709l.; payments on account of the Registration of Births and Deaths, 12,611l.; Vaccination Fees and Expenses, 13,191l.; expenses allowed in respect of Parliamentary Registration and costs of Jury Lists, 29,857l.; School Fees for non-pauper children, 189l.; other expenses unconnected with relief, 26,154l.; Costs of Legal Proceedings (Parochial and Union), 9,762l.; payments under the Union Assessments Committee Acts, 31,405l.; Salaries, Poundage, and Superannuation Allowances of Parochial Officers, and any other expenditure not previously specified, 91,161l.; making a total expenditure of 970,267l.

219. In regard to the casuals, I understand that they are not allowed to be received before four o'clock in winter-time and before six in the summer; what has been the object of that restriction?
They are dealt with as persons coming in for the night, and it was not intended that they should be taken in in the early hours of the day. There is an objection very often to having these people hanging about the vagrant ward on the part of the people residing in the neighbourhood. The Order states the time when they can be admitted.

220. But one can imagine a case of considerable hardship if a person had to wait in severe weather and was kept out until the clock had struck?
In an exceptional case the officer would probably admit him.

221. You find that the rule that they are not to be discharged till the second day works well in London?
It has worked well in checking vagrants coming in.

222. But
222. But why not before nine o'clock in the morning; supposing the man wants to go out to work, what is the advantage of keeping him till nine o'clock? That point I referred to, I think, in my evidence.

223. You said it was occasionally relaxed; that the person in authority occasionally relaxes it, the master, I suppose; but as a general rule they are not allowed to discharge themselves before nine in the morning?

That is the rule under the Order, but the guardians may make any exceptions they may think fit, and the Local Government Board, being impressed with the importance of the men being allowed to leave at an earlier hour when there was any good reason to suppose that they would seek for work, issued a circular letter calling the attention of the guardians to the matter, and advising them to let them leave at an early hour.

224. Chairman.] The Committee want to know why the hour of nine was fixed by the Order?

It followed the Order that was issued in 1871 after the passing of the first Act.

225. They have a task of work to perform before they go out in the morning, have they not?

Not in the cases where they are discharged at an earlier hour.

226. No, but I mean the ordinary case when they come in for the night; they have a task of work to perform before they go away in the morning?

Yes.

227. Lord Balfour of Burley.] But they are detained two nights?

If the powers of detention under the Act are exercised, they would not be discharged till the second morning after admission. They would be detained for one whole day, and discharged at nine or earlier on the following day.

228. Chairman.] Would they then have to perform two tasks of work?

No, only one.

229. Earl of Onslow.] But there has been a great complaint, has there not, that the result of not discharging the casual until nine o'clock in the day has had the effect of preventing his getting work that day; is there any truth or justice in that complaint?

We have not had many complaints to that effect, but the attention of the Board was drawn to the matter, and it was stated that it was a grievance, and that in the case of men who were willing to work it would seriously prejudice their opportunity of getting work. Our Order has followed the statute as regards the time of nine o'clock. Both the Act of 1871 and the Act of 1882 specified that hour.

230. But what action has the Board taken with regard to those complaints?

They sent a circular letter to the guardians in the metropolis, reminding them of the power that they had under the Order, of dispensing with compliance with the regulations in any class of cases which they thought fit, and recommending to them that they should allow the casuals to leave at an early hour in the morning, especially in those cases where there was any probability whatever that the men really wished to seek for work.

231. Earl of Milltown.] Has that suggestion been complied with?

I have no very definite information as to that.

232. I think you alluded to the bath which the casuals take; is every casual obliged to take a cold bath in winter?

No, it is not cold. The Order provides: "Every casual pauper shall, as soon as practicable after his admission, be cleansed in a bath with water of suitable temperature; provided that this regulation shall not be enforced if, on account of the state of health of the pauper, or other circumstances, there is reason to believe that the use of the bath would be injurious."

(70.)

233. With
233. With regard to this collection of persons last autumn in Trafalgar-square; what were the class of persons who slept there?
I should think to a considerable extent they were persons who would find their way to common lodging-houses or to the casual ward.

234. It is strictly illegal for them to sleep there, I suppose?
One would have thought so; it is an offence with which the police can deal, because there is no doubt that afterwards they brought some of these people before the magistrates.

235. They were the class of persons who usually frequent casual wards?
And the common lodging-houses.

236. With regard to the children who are emigrated to your agents, do your accounts show that they do well in the colonies?
Yes; the reports that we have received lead to that conclusion, certainly.

237. Are they sent to any colony except Canada?
No.

238. You gave an answer in reply to a question of the noble Earl in the Chair which I did not quite understand; you seemed to say that emigration would not diminish the pressure of population in the metropolis, because as soon as a certain number of persons were emigrated others would arrive to take their place; are you of opinion that more persons would arrive in the metropolis if emigration took place than do at present?
I think that would depend very much upon the extent to which the emigration was carried out, but if there were a very large number emigrated that would tend to create a demand for labour, and in districts outside London where employment was scarce I think there would be a disposition to come up to London.

239. But the arrival of persons from the country would be no great evil, because they would get employment if the emigration of the others created that need of labour?
Yes.

240. And in those circumstances, even if the places of the emigrants were filled up, the population would remain tolerably stationary, whereas, if the others had not been emigrated, it would have been increased by that number if there was a demand for their labour?
Yes, that would be so, no doubt.

241. Chairman.] But does not that assume that those people would have come into the town if there had been no emigration, whereas the argument is that they only come in in consequence of emigration; therefore the population is not stationary. Is not the argument this, that given that a certain number of people arrive habitually in London, if you diminish suddenly the population of London to any considerable extent, a larger number of people still will arrive to supply their places?
Yes, that is what I intended to say.

242. And that, consequently, the population will not be permanently relieved by the emigration; that is the argument?
Yes, that is what I had in my mind.

243. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is not it the fact that the slightest indication of an intention to open relief works, or to give assistance to any one applying for it, has the effect of attracting unemployed or half-employed people from all parts of the country to the point where those special efforts are being made?
Yes; we believe that the Mansion House Fund, for instance, brought a considerable number of people to London.

244. Earl of Onslow.] But does that apply equally to emigration?
It depends very much upon the extent to which you carry out the system of emigration; if you carried it out to a very large extent it would tend to increase the demand for labour and the number of people coming to London.

245. Is
245. Is it within your experience that when there has been any increased amount of emigration from London there has been an increased amount of immigration into London?

We have had no such emigration as I was anticipating in the remarks that I made; I was rather referring to a system of emigration carried out on a very large scale.

246. Earl of Milltown.] And on the supposition that it was on so large a scale that it would create a demand for labour?

Yes, materially increase it.

247. Then it would follow, as a matter of course, if there was an increased demand for labour there would be an increased supply of it; there would be no evil if these people obtained employment?

248. Chairman.] But is that so; supposing a demand was created simply in consequence of the supply being diminished, the result would be that, at the expense of rates, you would have brought about a state of things exactly the same as before. My question, of course, is confined to London, and not extending beyond it. If the process of relieving London only resulted in the same pressure being brought by an influx of population, the result would be that it would be in the same case as before?

Yes; London would derive no benefit.

249. Earl of Onslow.] But the people who would be emigrated would be those who had no employment, would they not, not those who were in employment?

The probability is that they would be those who were out of work; otherwise they would not find the guardians very anxious to assist them to go.

250. Therefore the emigration of the population which would be emigrated would not in any way increase the demand for labour?

I was rather referring to regular work; the people who would be emigrated would be working at times, but not in regular remunerative employment.

251. Chairman.] They are not people absolutely without the means of subsistence; they are people who have not full means of subsistence, who are employed part of the year only?

Yes.

252. Lord Thring.] What means have you of ascertaining the emigration and immigration into and out of London?

We have no means of ascertaining it.

253. What you say on the subject, therefore, is merely a matter of opinion?

As regards the immigration?

254. I want to know what accurate means you have of knowing how many would be coming into London as immigrants, and how many go out of London as emigrants?

We have no means of knowing.

255. Earl of Onslow.] Then I gather from what you said that, although the cost of maintaining a pauper in the house is considerably more than the average of out-door relief granted to a pauper, the result of applying the workhouse test very severely in the direction of the diminution of the rates is far in excess of any increase of the rates by reason of receiving more men into the workhouse:

Leaving London, for the reasons I have mentioned, and taking a country union where they have adopted a strict system, after having had a somewhat lavish administration of out-door relief, it has been found that the number of cases in which in-door relief has been accepted has been so few that there has been a considerable financial gain to the union.

256. Now, I daresay you are aware that the authorities in Canada have expressed some reluctance to receive boys from reformatory schools; is there any corresponding reluctance to receive boys from pauper schools?

(70.)
We have had no objection whatever from the Canadian Government on that ground. The boys who are sent from the reformatory schools are boys who have been actually convicted of crime, and we should say that the pauper children are of a better class even than the children from industrial schools, to say nothing of reformatory schools. And, moreover, the children sent out under the conditions to which I have referred are orphans and deserted children, the children who have been longest under the control of the guardians and the influence of the teachers, and who are usually by far the best of the children under the care of the guardians. As regards the orphan children, it would often happen that they are of a somewhat better class than the ordinary pauper children, as in many cases they would never have become chargeable to the rates at all had it not been for the death of the parents.

257. I think you said the boarding out of the children was confined to orphans and children in an analogous condition?

Yes.

258. What is the object of that?

Because the guardians have no control over the other children for any length of time. The children come into the workhouse with a father or a mother, and they may be taken out almost the next day; you cannot rely upon the children continuing under the care of the guardians for any fixed time; they may be taken away at any time that the parents may care to take them, and therefore it would be out of the question to send children of that class away from their parents to some distant place, perhaps to Windermere, where several of the London children are, under an arrangement which contemplates that they should continue for years under the foster parents' charge.

259. Would it be possible to secure the consent of the parents to their being left under the care of the guardians for a certain time, such time as the Board might think fit?

The only right that the guardians would have to maintain the child would be the destitution of the child. The guardians would object, and I think rightly so, to allow the father to go out of the workhouse and leave the child chargeable to the rates.

260. I do not think that you explained exactly how the committees for boarding out children are formed; are they purely voluntary agencies?

Purely voluntary agencies; both gentlemen and ladies usually form the committee, and they appoint a secretary. It is altogether an unpaid agency; the secretary is an honorary secretary, and the ladies and gentlemen of course receive nothing for their services.

261. They are not committees of the guardians, but entirely independent bodies?

Altogether independent of the Poor Law administration, except so far as they voluntarily undertake the care of these children.

262. I think you said that you thought that much gain might be obtained from a conference of the different Poor Law authorities as regards the application of the labour test?

I think that if the guardians of the metropolitan unions were to agree to some common line of action as regards the nature of the test it would be a very distinct advantage; but such an agreement is very difficult to bring about.

263. There are conferences, are there not, throughout the country of Poor Law authorities from time to time?

There are district conferences, and there is a general conference held in London; but the conference in London is rather for the whole of the country than for the metropolis.

264. Have those conferences resulted in agreement upon any system?

The questions discussed at the conferences have been generally questions of policy; for instance, the expediency of giving in-door relief in preference to out-door relief; and there can be no doubt, I think, that a much more intelligent interest has been taken in Poor Law questions by many guardians, in consequence
sequence of having attended these conferences, and having had the questions placed before them in a different light from that in which they had previously looked upon them.

265. And it is an increase and development of that system that your remarks were pointing to, especially as regards the metropolitan area?

No; I had rather in my mind a conference for the purpose of seeing how far a uniform system of out-door labour test could be adopted in the different London unions, or at any rate, in groups of London unions. I may say that Mr. Henley has been working in that direction in connection with Liverpool, where there are several unions included wholly or partly in one borough, and he is to be examined as a witness before the Committee, and can give information.

266. Lord Thring.] Did I understand rightly that the refusal of out-door relief diminishes the poor rates, because the poor man would rather decline any relief at all than go into the house?

Because the offer of relief in the workhouse is to a certain extent deterrent, and he will make every possible effort to avoid coming upon the rates at all if entering the workhouse is to be the result.

267. In other words, that in-door relief always acts as a terror?

I should not like to put it quite as strongly as that.

268. You say as a deterrent?

In-door relief is much less acceptable than out-door relief.

269. Do not you think that the feeling of dislike to going into the house is a good feeling in the poor man?

I think that the feeling which makes the man most anxious to avoid coming upon the rates at all, is a most praiseworthy one, but I do not see any special reason why a man should have no hesitation in taking out-door relief or should be pressed for taking out-door relief whilst he refuses to accept in-door relief.

270. A meritorious man finds himself sometimes temporarily disabled; he comes to the guardians and says he wants relief till he can get work; that man objects to go into the house because he thinks it infects a stain on him. Is that a feeling that is right, and to be encouraged?

I have no doubt there is a certain stigma attaching to going into the workhouse.

271. Do not you think that the man who does not wish that stigma to be affixed to him is on the whole a man of a higher class of feeling, a more meritorious man than a man who does not object to going into the workhouse?

Not necessarily, I think.

272. Do you then think a man who felt a stigma to be affixed to him by going into the workhouse would be a man of no higher feeling than a man who would not feel it a stigma affixed to him?

I should rather put it in this way, that to receive relief, either in-door or out-door, imposes a certain burden upon the ratepayers; that if a man breaks down and is obliged to become a charge upon the public rates, it is not quite for him to dictate as to the particular form in which that assistance should be given; that is a question for those who have to administer the rates; that he has no right to say that out-door relief will be more acceptable to him than relief in the workhouse.

273. Do not you think, as a matter of experience, that a better class of labourer, if driven to it by necessity, would rather accept out-door relief for a week or two, than he would have the stigma of going into the house?

No doubt he would prefer accepting out-door relief.

274. And would not the same man often starve rather than go into the workhouse?

No, I believe not. Cases of that kind, although they are often spoken about, are most exceptional. Where there is such a strong objection to going into the workhouse—the guardians having no power to enforce going into the workhouse—
workhouse—the relieving officer watches the case and gives such relief in kind only as may be absolutely necessary.

275. Do you not think that, in those cases where out-door relief is refused for the benefit of the rates, it would be a very good thing if some means were taken to report, what I should call the deserving cases, to some one of the organised charities?

I have no doubt that it is a very great boon to have organised charity intervening and affording relief in those cases where it would be admitted that a strict application of the Poor Law might be regarded as a hardship.

276. Therefore I should have thought that it would be very very desirable if some alliance could be made between the Poor Law authorities and charities, so that the charity should intervene in all deserving or quasi deserving cases?

I have no doubt of it, and I may say that in London, in those parishes where the workhouse test is most strictly enforced, there are members of the Charity Organisation Society who are acting as guardians, and it is not at all unusual for them to intervene and say, "We will relieve the guardians of this case."

277. Therefore you do not think that there would be any great practical difficulty in organising such a system if people would take the trouble:

I do not; and it would relieve the rates of those cases.

278. Can you give me any information as to where that system is carried out of the combination of charity and Poor Law administration?

I believe that in St. George's-in-the-East, I think in Whitechapel, and also in Kensington there are members of the boards of guardians who are connected with the Charity Organisation Society, and that they undertake the charge of cases.

279. I suppose the Charity Organisation will inform us upon that point?

Mr. Hedley will probably be able to give you information upon that point.

280. As to the country, can you give us any information as to whether there is any Charity Organisation Society acting in the same way?

No, I am not able to do so.

281. Chairman.] Referring to a question asked you just now, do you think there is anything meritorious in a man wishing to get relief from the rates in a more comfortable manner?

No.

282. Do you think it is a fair way of putting the case, to say that the man is deprived of the relief in a more acceptable manner merely to relieve the rates; is not the object something more important, namely, to deprive him of relief, the tendency of giving which is to demoralise the whole population?

I think so; and that fact is at times hardly sufficiently borne in mind by the guardians. They have before them a particular case of an individual and they think of him only, and do not consider what the effect of giving relief to him may be upon others.

283. But the main difficulty of administering the Poor Law is the impossibility, in enforcing general rules which are really salutary and necessary, of avoiding an appearance in individual cases of hardship?

Yes, that is so; and, therefore, the general regulations that have been laid down by the Board all admit of exceptions to meet special cases.

284. But you would entirely approve of any system which would promote the dealing with such cases by charitable means (so as to avoid hardship on particular individuals) apart from the Poor Law?

I think the stricter your administration of the Poor Law, the more important it is to have such a system as that you refer to.

285. Lord Thring.] Do you, or do you not, think that the strict refusal of out-door relief must, and does, give occasion to a great many cases of hardship?

No;
No; I think that when in-door relief is given the person is better housed, better fed, and better clothed than a very large number of those persons who are maintaining themselves independently, and that as long as that is done the State discharges its duty, and that there is no ground for complaint on the part of the individual.

286. I admit that; but the question is this: you tell me that you admit that a man often refuses relief because he does not like the stigma of the workhouse; is it, or is it not, a hardship to that man not to have relief?

Poverty is always a hardship.

287. Earl of Aberdeen.] In the case suggested by Lord Thring, of a man wishing to tide over a short period, say a week, when he may have the prospect of getting work, is not the hardship also this, not merely the form of relief, but the fact that if he goes into the workhouse he must break up his home, and thereby lose, to a large extent, the prospect of the work which he might otherwise obtain?

I think you would find there would be very few boards of guardians who, if they had before them the case of a man who through no fault of his own only required to be tided over by a week by relief, would not give him out-door relief for a week.

288. I want to know how far the practice of so enabling men to tide over the difficulty is resorted to; is the individual case brought before the guardians; does it not rest with the officer to whom the application is made?

If relief were applied for, and relief was necessary in the interval between the meetings of the guardians, the relieving officer would give relief on his own authority; but then he would have to inquire as to the facts, and report the facts to the guardians; and they, with a knowledge of all the circumstances, would determine whether it should be in-door or out-door relief, and if out-door relief, what particular amount should be given to the man.

289. Earl Spencer.] But you would prefer, in a case of that sort, that the person should be relieved from his home being broken up by some private charitable organisation?

You may have cases where a man has endeavoured to make provision for himself and his family, where from circumstances entirely beyond his control he has broken down, and must come upon others for relief. In a case like that you would be glad if the man could be relieved from going into the workhouse, or even having the taint of receiving relief from the guardians at all; and that some timely help should be given to set him going again. That is rather a case for charity than for the Poor Law, and charity under such circumstances would be of the greatest value.

290. You would prefer it to the Poor Law in such cases?

Yes.

291. Lord Thring.] Is not your opinion that in-door relief is far the best system; that with regard to out-door relief, while it should be refused, there ought to be exceptions in favour of it; and better than all, that charity should intervene instead of out-door relief?

Yes.

292. Earl Spencer.] The important matters of out-door relief are the medical extras?

Yes.

293. Is there a great deal given in the way of medical extras in London to the poor?

As regards the out-door poor, the medical attendance on the out-door poor of London is somewhat exceptional. There is a system of dispensaries in London; each union or parish has one or more of these dispensaries, a certain number of medical officers being assigned to each one. The relieving officer when applied to for a medical order ascertains whether the case is an urgent one or not; if it is urgent he gives an order for the medical officer to visit at the home of the patient;
patient; if not, he gives an order for attendance at the dispensary, assuming that the patient is able to attend. The medical officer is always at the dispensary for a certain number of hours each day; there is a dispenser there who dispenses the medicines, and the medicines are provided at the cost of the guardians. In that way a better administration of relief, so far as medical attendance is concerned, has been secured than was formerly the case.

204. Are the dispensaries established entirely at the cost of the guardians? Entirely at the cost of the guardians. The cost of the medicines to the extent of one half is defrayed out of a Parliamentary Grant, and it is the same as regards a majority of the salaries of the medical officers and dispensers.

205. And the hire of the houses or places where the dispensaries are held? That is entirely a charge upon the guardians.

206. It is not carried out by a voluntary association at all? No, it is a part of the Poor Law system of relief in London.

207. Are these dispensaries given the medical extras as they do in the country; I am more familiar with the country practice than that in London? Yes; if wine or spirits were ordered, they would usually be supplied from the dispensary.

208. Is there any abuse of the dispensing of wine and extras of that sort? I have no reason to suppose that there is in London.

209. I know of some districts in the country where they have enormously reduced the amount for medical extras, such as wine; one union where, I think, that has almost been dispensed with for several years. There is no doubt that the practice of different medical officers varies very much indeed; that one is very free and another less free in the ordering of stimulants, and that relieving officers feel great hesitation in not acting on the recommendations of the medical officers. There are cases where guardians have felt some irritation at the amount of the extras ordered.

210. And there have been cases where real injury has been done to individuals by the lavish use of spirits? I do not know as an actual fact of any cases of that kind.

211. You do not know that in London there have been any particular cases of that kind? You mean, in consequence of an excessive allowance of stimulants, injury has been done to individuals. No, I cannot say that I do.

212. Has there been much tendency in London on the part of medical officers to order stimulants and wine? There is the greatest difference in different unions. There was a Parliamentary Return presented this year giving the particulars as to the quantity per head in each workhouse and infirmary in London.

213. Are there any medical clubs in the parishes in London like those that there are in the country? There are dispensaries; I doubt whether there are clubs to any large extent of the character you refer to.

214. In some parts of the country the voluntary clubs do a great deal of the medical work, do they not? Yes; it is so in many parts of the country.

215. There are not many medical clubs, you think, in London? There are a number of dispensaries where, by paying a very small sum, attendance or medicine can be obtained, and I think that many persons avail themselves of them to a large extent.

216. Lord Balfour of Burley.] I do not know whether in England you are troubled with a class of paupers whom we know in Scotland by the name of "in-and-outers," those who are perpetually taking their discharge and as perpetually
petually coming back upon the Poor Law authorities; with all the trouble and all the expense consequent upon that method of proceeding. If so, I wish to know whether you have any suggestion to make whereby the regulations placing difficulties in the way of that course of conduct could be made more stringent than they are at the present time?

There is no doubt that there are in many unions a certain number of persons of the class that you refer to. They give the guardians the greatest possible amount of annoyance. They leave the workhouse very frequently; stay away for day or two, or perhaps come back in the evening after having left in the morning; and this happens time after time, and the guardians have no control over their discharging themselves. A considerable number of boards of guardians in England have memorialised that there should be an alteration of the law in this matter. But the law could only be altered by laying down some general rules as to compulsory detention. You could hardly entrust to the guardians the detaining of a man for a considerable period, unless you could very clearly specify in the Act the circumstances which would justify it. It would be compulsory detention; in fact, imprisonment; and the difficulty which has been felt has been that to confer a power to meet those very exceptional cases (the cases in any one union not being numerous) you would have to enact provisions so stringent that they might act very prejudicially to persons who might at short intervals be leaving the workhouse with an honest intention to find work.

307. The class I refer to habitually come out upon public holidays, and occasions of fairs and special gatherings in the district, and usually come home intoxicated in the evening; would it not be possible to devise some regulations which would apply to those who are habitually offenders in that respect?

The question was considered by the President of the Board; and, after having heard the representations that had been made to him by a deputation, and also the statements in the memorials to which I have referred, he doubted very much whether he could make out such a case as would induce Parliament to give the powers of detention, or imprisonment as it would virtually be, which the guardians desired.

308. Earl of Milltown.] Or refusal to re-admit?
You cannot refuse; that is the difficulty.

309. Lord Thring.] You are not bound to take a drunken man in, I suppose; the guardians are not bound to take a man in actually in a state of intoxication, are they?
I think so; unless the police will take charge of him.

310. Lord Hopetown.] Is there any large proportion of foreigners amongst the people who receive relief?

About the middle of last year the Board addressed a letter to all the boards of guardians in the East-end of London, as to whether there had been any considerable increase in the number of foreigners chargeable on the rates, or whether they had any reason to consider that the number of poor chargeable had been indirectly increased by the number of foreign immigrants; and the replies that were received were generally to the effect that in very few cases were there foreigners chargeable on the rates, and that there had been no serious effect, so far as the charges on the rates were concerned, from the immigration of foreigners.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
Die Lunæ, 23⁰ Aprilis, 1888.
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THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. JOSEPH JOHN HENLEY, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

311. Lord Balfour.] You are one of the General Inspectors of the Local Government Board?
I am.

312. Your experience extends over twenty years, and you have been employed in special inquiries, both in Scotland and in the United States for the Local Government Board?
I have.

313. The district of which you are Inspector includes parts of Surrey and Middlesex out of town, the counties of Berks, Bucks, Oxon, Warwick, and one union in Worcestershire, as well as the union county of Lancaster, does it not?
Yes, containing a population in the first-mentioned district of 1,797,320, and in Lancashire of 3,521,342, making a total of 5,318,662, according to the census of 1881.

314. Speaking generally, relief is administered in the urban portions of the district under the out-door relief regulation order, and in the rural portion under the out-door relief prohibitory order?
It is.

315. You will speak first as regards Birmingham, and then as regards the Liverpool and Manchester groups respectively?
Yes.

316. What have you to say as regards Birmingham?
The relief at Birmingham is administered under a Local Act. The guardians are elected for three years upon a 12 l. franchise, and the law is administered under the Local Act and orders of the Local Government Board.

317. Chairman.] Is there any special qualification for a guardian at Birmingham?
Yes, there is a qualification; but I am not quite sure what it is.

318. There is some qualification of a special kind for a guardian?
Yes.

319. Lord Balfour.] It is the fact, is it not, that at Birmingham the relief committee meets at nine o'clock on five days of the week?
They do.

(70.) F 3:0. The
320. The officers employed in administering relief are the superintendent of
out-relief, what is called the cross visitor, who makes surprise visits to various
districts, six relieving officers, and a pay clerk?
That is so.

321. You will hand in a copy of the rules and regulations under which relief
is administered?
Yes. This is a copy of the rules, prepared by the guardians themselves,
although they are guided generally by the orders of the Local Government
Board (handing in the same).

322. The relief committee which you mentioned is a committee of the guar-
dians themselves, is it not?
It is. The town is divided between enough committees to meet five days in
the week.

323 Will you give us the statistics of outdoor relief since 1883?
I may, perhaps, say at first, that these regulations are only of recent date,
and the appointment of the cross visitor, and of the superintendent relieving
officer is also of recent date. At a time of great pressure, some six or seven
years ago, the guardians found that the outdoor relief was becoming excessive,
and they thought it necessary to take steps to very closely investigate the
matter. The result of their inquiries was that they appointed a larger staff of
relieving officers to investigate the relief. They appointed a superintendent
relieving officer, whose duties were to be generally to supervise the whole of
the relief districts in Birmingham, and a cross visitor who was to be employed
by the superintendent relieving officer to make visits of surprise to different parts
of Birmingham extending into all the other relieving officers' districts.

324. Chairman.] He is a check upon the action of the district relieving
officer?
He is not only a check upon the district relieving officer, but persons come
to know pretty well when the relieving officer's visits would be likely to be
made, and the cross-visitor was instructed to make visits of surprise at night
time, and at other times, so that he might find out whether any fraud was being
committed upon the guardians.

325. Lord Balfour.] That is to say, visits to the homes of those who are in
receipt of out-relief, in order that he might find out their mode of life, and
whether they were in receipt of money which they did not return to the
guardians?
That was so.

326. Lord Thring.] Is he a paid officer?
He is. I had better, perhaps, read to you a paragraph from the first report
of the superintendent relieving officer, dated the 26th of January 1885. He
says: "The object of the guardians in introducing the new regulations is thus
stated in the report of the special outdoor relief inquiry committee which was
adopted by the board, viz. 'That by frequent visitation correct information
will be obtained, and that whilst deserving persons will receive the relief and
attention they require, cases of imposture will be readily found out and dealt
with as they deserve to be.'"

327. Lord Balfour.] You wish to give some figures showing the course of
outdoor relief since 1883, do you not?
Yes. On the 1st of January 1884, there were 2,672 persons receiving indoor
relief at Birmingham, and there were 4,364 receiving outdoor relief, being a
total of 7,036, or one pauper to 35 of the population. In 1885 there were
3,049 persons receiving indoor relief, and there were 3,790 receiving outdoor relief,
making a total of 6,849, or a proportion of one in 35 to the population. In
1886 there were 3,046 persons receiving indoor relief, and 3,491 receiving
out-door relief, making a total of 6,537, or one in 37 of the population. In
1887 there were 3,176 persons receiving indoor relief, and 3,100 receiving
out-door relief, making a total of 6,276, or one in 39 of the population. In
1888 there were 3,155 persons receiving indoor relief, and 2,370 receiving outdoor relief, making a total of 5,525, or one in 44 of the population.

328. Chairman.] Is that the estimated population?
No, the population of 1881.

329. Lord Balfour.] There would, therefore, be a larger proportionate decrease than those figures show upon the surface?
Yes. The population of Birmingham is not increasing very largely, in consequence of the great improvements in the town. The population of Aston, which forms part of the Borough of Birmingham, is increasing in a larger proportion than the Parish of Birmingham.

330. Are these figures taken for corresponding parts of each year, so as to form a fair comparison?
They are taken on one day, the 1st of January of each year, so that a pauper can only be counted once. Perhaps the Committee will now allow me to give for the first year the cases in which the guardians discontinued giving relief to certain persons under their new regulations. This is for the year 1884, the first year that the new regulations came into effect, and the report is dated January 1885. There were 12 cases where women had been found cohabiting with men; there were nine cases of drunkenness; there were 13 cases of withholding information; there were three cases of income sufficient to maintain the family; there were four cases of widows who have had illegitimate children since they have been receiving relief; there were four cases of non-appearance at the relief committee; there were two cases where relief was subsequently re-granted; and there were two cases of filthy homes, making a total of 49 cases. In cases where relief was being received, and relief committees deemed it advisable, either because there was sufficient income to maintain the family, or they were undeserving, or it may be desirable for infirmity treatment, an order for the house was made. There have been 170 of such cases during the year, and they may be thus classified: Cases in which there was sufficient income to maintain family, 62; women with illegitimate children, 5; ill, and having dirty homes, 42; irregular school attendance, 13; drinking, 21; withholding information, 19; desertion, 3; husband in prison, 3; left the parish, 1; begging, 1; making a total of 170.

331. When out-door relief was discontinued, were all those people absolutely struck off the roll, except in the two cases that you mentioned, or were they put into the workhouse?
They were struck off the roll, but if they had applied for the workhouse they would have received an order for the workhouse.

332. And none of them did so, I understand?
It appears not.

333. You read some figures of some cases of persons to whom the house was offered; do you know whether they accepted it or not?
I have figures here which show the proportion of persons who were offered the workhouse, and the proportion of persons who accepted it, which I will give if the Committee will allow me to do so presently.

334. Chairman] You mentioned the refusal of out-door relief to women with illegitimate children; under the order which applies to Birmingham, is it lawful for the guardians in any case to give out-door relief to a woman with illegitimate children?
They are not under the prohibitory order at all, and I do not think there is anything in that order to prevent the guardians from giving relief to a woman with an illegitimate child. They could not do it, as you know, in the country where the prohibitory order is in force.

335. Lord Balfour.] When you speak of withholding information from the guardians, is it that they withhold information as to the amount of their income, or upon some point of their circumstances, or upon what do they withhold information?

(70.)
When persons apply for relief, they are obliged to make a clean breast of it, to show what means they have, what relatives they have capable of supporting them, whether they have any money in any bank, and in fact, whether they are, as they say, truly and entirely destitute. If they make a false statement, they are liable to imprisonment, but if they withhold the information the guardians then very properly, generally offer them the workhouse.

336. Will you furnish the figures which you wish to put before us upon these points?

The next table that I should like to read to you proves conclusively to my mind that the new regulations have not contributed in the slightest degree towards the increase of the indoor poor. People generally go into the workhouse in one of two ways; either by the order of the committee, or by going to the workhouse and saying that they are in such a destitute condition that they require to be admitted as a case of sudden and urgent necessity; but, as a rule, the committee give the orders for relief. In 1880 there were 1,402 orders made by the committee for the workhouse, the number of persons being 3,400; there were 607 of those orders used, and 964 of those persons were admitted to the workhouse. In 1881 there were 1,333 orders made representing 3,271 persons; 521 orders were used, and 795 persons were admitted to the workhouse. In 1882 there were 1,196 orders made, the number of persons being 2,745; there were 445 orders used, and 642 persons admitted to the workhouse. In 1883 there were 1,138 orders made, the number of persons being 2,880; there were 344 orders used, and 497 persons admitted to the workhouse. In 1884 there were 1,083 orders made, the number of persons being 2,682; there were 186 orders used, and 296 persons were admitted to the workhouse. These regulations affect only those cases which come before the relief committees, and in no way interfere with direct applications to the relieving officers. If, therefore, the numbers in the workhouse have increased by orders from relief committees there would have been given a larger number of such orders than in previous years; but instead of such an increase a smaller number of orders have been made by the relief committees than in any year during the last five years, and a smaller number used of those orders by more than one-fifth than did so in the year 1880.

337. What is the inference which you draw from those figures?

That the guardians have investigated the cases much more closely than they used to investigate them; that persons are now fully aware that if they come before the relief committees their cases will be closely investigated; they know that if they really require out-door relief they will get it in a better form than they have ever had it before; but that if their cases are such that they cannot come under these regulations, they would not receive out-door relief, they will then avoid coming to the committee at all.

338. Earl of Milltown.] There seems to be an extraordinary discrepancy between the number of orders issued and the number of orders used; for instance, you stated that in 1884, 1,083 orders were issued, and that there were only 186 orders used: what is the meaning of that?

As a rule, the more closely you investigate the cases, generally the larger proportion of orders you will find is used.

339. Lord Balfour.] Have you anything to tell us with regard to the action of the Birmingham guardians as to the employment of paupers under Article 6 of the Out-Regulation Order; that is what we know as the labour test?

Article 6 of the Out-Regulation Order says: “Every able-bodied male person, if relieved out of the workhouse, shall be set to work by the guardians, and kept employed under their direction and superintendence, so long as he continues to receive relief.” That form of relief was very largely used in Birmingham a few years ago. During a time of exceptional pressure there was a very large number of men employed upon the out-door labour-test order; but it was found in practice to be one of the most demoralising forms of relief that could possibly be
be adopted. It was impossible to keep the men closely to work to perform their task of work; it was also impossible to know what they were doing during the night time after they received their relief; and it was also found that it was really reverting back very much to the old gravel-pit system, under which men considered that they had a right to receive either relief or work from the guardians; and the guardians determined during the summer of 1884, I think, to put an end to this system altogether. They quite admitted that in time of very exceptional pressure when the workhouse was full it might be necessary to revert again to the out-door labour-test system; but they thought that under ordinary circumstances they might meet the cases, either by giving ordinary out-door relief, or by giving in exceptional cases short relief; but that, as a general rule, they would offer the workhouse to all able-bodied men that went before them.

340. Had that policy your approval, and, the approval of the Local Government Board?
Yes, the Local Government Board sanctioned the erection of a test-house, which is a house entirely for able-bodied men, which, perhaps, I had better mention when I come to the question of the in-door relief at Birmingham.

341. Since when has the labour-test yard at Birmingham been closed?
It has never been opened at all to paupers. After that they constructed a very large yard indeed to meet any exceptional difficulties. On one occasion, I think in the winter of 1884 and 1885, they lent the stone-yard for a short time to the corporation, and to some charitable people for the purpose of having stone broken there; but since that time, although they have been very much pressed by influential persons and others to open the stone-yard, they have steadfastly adhered to their determination to the very great advantage of the town, and to a very large diminution, as you have seen, of out-door relief.

342. They have made considerable reforms as to the treatment of the sick poor out of doors in the last few years at Birmingham, have they not?
Yes, very much so. Birmingham, like all other towns, has found that the increase of the sick poor has been out of all proportion to the increase of other classes of inmates, and they have been compelled, first of all, to remove certain classes away from the workhouse to make room for their sick poor. They removed their children to an excellent institution in the country, called Marston Green Cottage Homes, and they removed their able-bodied poor to the test-house. But in spite of all that, they have had to continue building for the sick poor, and they are at this moment constructing a very large infirmary, which will accommodate something like a thousand sick poor.

343. That will be for the indoor sick poor; I was asking about the out-door sick poor. At Birmingham they have provided a dispensary with medical officers, who devote their whole time to the work, have they not?
Yes, they provided a dispensary some years ago. Dispensaries are provided now, I think, very generally in London, but not generally in the other towns. Their object in providing a dispensary was that they might secure that the poor had the very best drugs that could be purchased at wholesale price; and it also relieves their medical officers to a certain extent, because, having a dispenser there, they have only to give prescriptions and have the medicine made up. But the medical officer is compelled to give a house-attendance whenever the case required it. Then they have lately tried the experiment of reducing the number of their district medical officers, not allowing them to be employed in private practice, but making them devote their whole time to the service of the parish; and, so far as that has gone, they highly approve of it.

344. Is there any means taken to prevent those who ought not to get this form of relief from getting it?
It is very closely watched, but there is no doubt that the action of Parliament two or three years ago, did for a short time increase the sick poor.

(70.)
345. What do you mean by the action of Parliament?
With regard to the disqualification of persons receiving medical relief?

346. You are referring to the Medical Relief Disqualification in 1885?
Yes.

347. With regard to the indoor sick poor at Birmingham, there has been a considerable increase of that class in the last few years, has there not?
Very large indeed. The number of indoor sick poor has risen from 430 in 1860 to 1,397 in 1888.

348. Can you give the Committee any reason for that increase?
It is rather a matter of opinion than anything else, but I believe that the causes that have been at work are, first of all, that the accommodation for the sick in the workhouse is so very much better than it used to be, being equal now to any public hospital, and, secondly, that the persons who come into the workhouse have to pay nothing whatever for it; whereas in every general hospital they have to pay some little amount for tea, sugar, soap, towels or something. Then, undoubtedly, in Birmingham there have been more persons living in lodging-houses than there used to be; that I am told by the relieving officers, and directly persons become sick in a lodging house (not in a common lodging-house, but in lodgings) the people in the lodgings not unnaturally want to get rid of them. It is not the action of the guardians that drives these people into the sick wards, but it is pressure from the outside, and pressure from the people themselves to get into the infirmary. The guardians have tried over and over again by committees and in other ways to stem the stream, to see, in fact, whether there were any persons in the infirmary who ought not to be there; but they failed entirely to check it, and they have been compelled to keep building. I may say that this difficulty was not overlooked a great many years ago, because in a report signed by Sir George Cornewall Lewis, Sir George Nicholls, and Sir John Lefevre, in 1839, they say this: "Throughout all the Unions in which we have established workhouses, this principle of the workhouse system is very well understood as respects the able-bodied labourers, and, with very few exceptions the benefits which arise from its application are admitted and appreciated. With regard to the aged and infirm, however, there is a strong disposition on the part of the public so to modify the arrangements of these establishments as to place them on the footing of almshouses. The consequences which would flow from this change have only to be pointed out to show its inexpediency and its danger. If the condition of the inmates of a workhouse were to be so regulated as to invite the aged and infirm of the labouring classes to take refuge in it, it would immediately be useless as a test between indigence and indolence or fraud; it would no longer operate as an inducement to the young and healthy to provide support for their later years, or as a stimulus to them, whilst they have the means, to support their aged parents and relatives. The frugality and forethought of a young labourer would be useless if he foresaw the certainty of a better asylum for his old age, than he could possibly provide by his own exertions; and the industrious efforts of a son to provide a maintenance for his parents in his own dwelling would be thrown away, and would cease to be called forth, if the almshouse of the district offered a refuge for their declining years, in which they might obtain comforts and inducements which even the most successful of the labouring classes cannot always obtain by their own exertions." No one who has been in the habit of looking at workhouses for many years can doubt that the workhouses have become now so comfortable, especially in large towns, that there is not the objection that there used to be among all classes of the poor to come into them.

349. Are you speaking specially of the hospital accommodation?
And of the aged and infirm who are very nearly approaching the sick. The bedridden are very often classed as the sick.

350. There has been a further sub-division of classes in Birmingham, just as there has been in the metropolis, has there not, and special wards provided for the imbecile, and those who are weak in intellect?
Yes; there are some very excellent imbecile wards.

351. To
351. To what extent has that gone in Birmingham?

The Birmingham guardians provided some years ago separate imbecile wards, though they are part of the workhouse, and under paid officers; and a great number of persons of the harmless class, who, in other places, would be sent to asylums, are kept in the workhouse.

352. You were just going to speak about the test-house which has been built at Birmingham, and you gave us some of the reasons for building it; will you describe the method by which men and women are drafted from the workhouse to this test-house?

Yes; some of the persons are admitted by the orders of the relieving officers; but as a general rule they pass through the workhouse. This test-house was constructed by the guardians for this reason; they found that during the time of pressure, which I mentioned before, they had very great difficulty with regard to those persons who were employed under the labour test order. In Birmingham they had a particular difficulty in the matter, because they could not put persons who were employed as jewellers, lockfitters, and other skilled labour, to ordinary hard work. Therefore, so far as the single able-bodied men were concerned, they borrowed from the corporation a large disused factory, and fitted it up rapidly as a branch workhouse, and offered the test to all the single able-bodied men. It was so very successful that they determined next summer to build this test house. They do things very rapidly in Birmingham. They built a three storied building of brick and slate in six weeks, and it was then opened. The dietary table, of which I have a copy here, is quite equal to, if not better than that in many workhouses. It was at first opened for men.

353. What test of labour do they impose?

They pick oakum.

354. Is not that liable to the same objection as stone breaking from the point of view of those whose hands require to be kept fine?

Yes, but they would be particularly careful in Birmingham not to put any person to pick oakum, or do work of any sort, so as to injure his hands, and prevent his going back to his trade.

355. What test can be imposed upon those whose hands require to be kept soft for the purposes of their trade?

It is very difficult to find any test for them. The work of tying up bundles of wood has often been used as a test for these people, the able-bodied men cutting up the wood into small pieces, and the old men and those other men who are not used to hard labour tying up the bundles for the purpose of sale in the town, or use in the workhouse. The Committee will perhaps permit me to read a short statement with regard to this test-house. This is a memorandum that I wrote at the time upon a letter from the clerk to the guardians addressed to me: "In the month of October 1880 plans were sanctioned by the Board for the erection of a workhouse for able-bodied men at Birmingham, which has been named by the guardians 'The Test-house.' This building was opened for occupation on the 15th November 1880. Upon the 27th January 1881, the Birmingham guardians obtained the consent of the Board to receive a limited number of able-bodied men from the West Bromwich Workhouse. The following extract from a letter addressed by the clerk to the guardians to the inspector of the district testifies to the success of the experiment: 'Return from week ended 20th November 1880 to week ended 26th February 1881. Test-house.—Number of orders given by relieving officers, 276; number of such orders used, 274; sent direct from Birmingham Workhouse or West Bromwich Workhouse, 110. Total admitted, 384; discharged, 340; remaining on 26th February 1881, 44; average length of stay in the test-house, about one week. Strict discipline has been maintained, all refractory pampers being taken before the magistrates and summarily dealt with. The test-house has had an immensely deterrent effect upon idle, dissolute, and worthless fellows. Its success is far beyond the most sanguine expectations of the guardians.' During the week ended 1st of January 1881, no persons were set to work in the stone-yard under (70.)
the provisions of the out-door labour test-order, whereas in the corresponding
week of 1880 the number of cases so relieved was 706."

356. An able-bodied pauper in the test-house has, I presume, the same power
discharging himself by giving proper notice as if he was in the ordinary
workhouse?
Entirely.

357. If he left the test-house he would be admitted to the ordinary workhouse
or given out-door relief, I presume?
He might be ill, or there might be a change in his circumstances; but he
has a perfect right to discharge himself from the workhouse, and if he applies
again his case will be again considered upon its merits.

358. Have you any facts to give the Committee beyond those contained in
that letter, as to the deterrent influence of this system in Birmingham?
During the whole of the last two or three winters, when there has been the
greatest possible pressure upon other parts of the workhouse, the test-house has
been, I may say, nearly empty; there have never been more than between
30 or 40 people in the test-house, and I have a return this morning from
Birmingham showing that there are only 11 men and five women in it at the
present time.

359. Is the application of the test-house confined to single men living in
lodgings, or are the heads of families, who have others depending on them,
offered it as well?
It is not confined to single men. If there should be men in the workhouse
who are troublesome, and require to be classified, they would be put there. It
is a workhouse for classification, not for punishment.

360. It would not practically occur that men who had families outside were
admitted to the test-house; and no action at all has been taken, as I understand,
on the lines of the orders sanctioned for the Whitechapel Board of Guardians?
No; we have no order of that sort in force at Birmingham. I am aware of
the Whitechapel order; but I know nothing to prevent the guardians receiving
a man into the test-house and allowing his family to be outside. Having so
much room, they have since used a part of the test-house for women.

361. Is it the fact that during the time that this system has been in force
outdoor pauperism has been diminished in Birmingham, and indoor pauperism
has not materially increased?
There is an increase in the indoor poor, but the increase is almost entirely in
the case of the sick and the children at Marston Green.

362. The policy of the Birmingham guardians with regard to the children is
to put them as far as possible into cottage homes, is it not?
Yes.

363. Have you any facts and figures to give us in regard to these homes?
The guardians, although they have most excellent accommodation just outside
the workhouse for children, found that they must utili-e that for some other
purpose; and they therefore determined to remove the children altogether from
the workhouse. They went both into England and Scotland to find out what
they considered the best method of dealing with children, and they eventually
selected the plan of the Home for Little Boys at Farningham, which is a
charitable institution; and they determined then to buy a property, and to
build cottages. They bought 43 acres of land near Birmingham, and they
erected upon it seven cottages for boys and seven cottages for girls. They erected
a superintendent officer's residence, workshops, infirmaries, a school, a covered
playground, and a lodge; and, of course, they had to make roads and drain the
land, and do various other things. They expended in this a sum of 41,856l. 19s. 5d.;
that was the first cost of erecting and furnishing the homes. Each of those homes
is occupied either by a man and his wife, who take charge of the boys, or by a
woman,
woman, who takes charge of the girls; and they have workshops in connection with the homes for all such trades as are generally used in Birmingham. They find that in practice the boys infinitely prefer to go into the workshops to going upon the land at all. But, at the same time, I think the result has been most satisfactory; at any rate, the guardians are very well satisfied with it.

364. In point of cost, how does it compare with the workhouse system of treatment of children?

The cost at first sight appears rather higher than that of the workhouse system, but the workhouse accounts are not made up to include everything. The cost of maintenance at Marston Green Homes is 2 s. 10 1/2 d., and the total cost 7 s. 4 d. per week.

365. On other grounds, such as the health of the children, and the prospect of their doing well in after-life, I understand you to think that the balance of advantage is immensely on the side of the homes?

Immensely. Before they left the workhouse the children were never free from either skin diseases or ophthalmia, and all those diseases which seem inherent in children in the workhouse. Since they have been there the infirmary has often had no children whatever in it. Of course for slight ailments they are taken care of in the homes themselves, but only a small number of children have to be dealt with by the doctor. It is only right to say that children are kept strictly in quarantine in the workhouse before they leave, and that they are kept in quarantine when they arrive at the homes; so that if anything of a serious nature develops they would be returned back to the workhouse. But no one can look at the children and remember what they were at the workhouse and see them now without being struck by the remarkable change in their whole manner, appearance, and condition.

366. From your experience, in the case of any children who are likely to be for any time chargeable to the rates, the proper policy is to endeavour to get them into these homes, if possible?

I think so; and I may say that the West Derby Union, which is the largest in England, after making inquiries all over England and considering every system, have determined to adopt the Birmingham system of cottage homes.

367. What is the average number of children in those homes?

There are about 30 children in each house; between 400 and 500 children altogether.

368. Earl Spencer.] You gave some figures with regard to the offer of the house; what was the proportion of those who accepted to those who were offered the house?

I gave the actual number. I should like to supplement that answer by saying that the latest return which we have is the return of 1887, according to which the number of orders made by the relief committee is very much smaller than it was before, but the proportion of orders accepted is larger, showing that the relief committees have very closely investigated the cases. There were 172 orders only made by the committees in the year 1887, comprising 347 persons; there were 56 of those orders used, and 85 persons went into the workhouse.

369. Do you believe that among the sick who now go into a hospital there are a great many who ought not to be there, but ought to find medical relief for themselves?

I can hardly think so, because the Birmingham guardians are a most active body of men, and they have taken great interest in the matter, and they have endeavoured, as I said before, to sift out those who really ought not to be there. Some years ago they got an order issued by the Local Government Board to enable them to recover relief by way of a loan from any persons who came into the workhouse; but in practice they find that they have not been able to do any good with that, and they have latterly had several committees to sift the matter. 
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matter over again, and to see whether they could not remove any of those people.

370. What happened to those poor people before these greater comforts in hospitals were created?
They got on as they could in their own lodgings. The nursing now is very much improved. The old rough sort of nursing by paupers is entirely done away with, and you have a better class of persons altogether; and people know outside that the conditions are improved, and they seek the workhouse.

371. Did they receive out-door medical attendance under the Poor Law before?
No doubt, because the out-door relief, which includes a great many of those persons, has been diminished, and the in-door relief increased.

372. Is there a great variety in the quantity of the medical relief given in Birmingham by the different medical officers?
No. Last week I see that the officer of the first district had 14 dispensary cases and 27 home cases; the next 19 dispensary cases and 12 home cases; the next 12 dispensary cases and 20 home cases; the next 26 dispensary cases and 20 home cases; the next 12 dispensary cases and nine home cases; and the next nine dispensary cases and 11 home cases. There were 204 cases, and the largest number that any one of the medical officers had was 37, and the smallest number 20.

373. Do the several medical officers deal with about the same amount of population and poverty?
Yes; they have re-arranged the districts so far as they possibly can, so as to give each a fair share of the work.

374. Do the medical extras, like wines, and beer, and so on, vary very much?
Not with regard to the outdoor poor. There is extremely little given in Birmingham.

375. Has that been reduced lately?
It has been reduced, I think, ever since the dispensary has been started, but the guardians have never given much in relief in that form in Birmingham; it has not been a town where the guardians have ever given stimulants to outdoor poor.

376. With regard to the test-house, I understand from you that it is really a matter of classification, and that formerly the workhouse test was offered to people asking for relief?
Certainly it was; but in consequence of the improved condition of the workhouses it is almost impossible in an ordinary workhouse, in a town where you have 2,000 or 3,000 people in it, to enforce the workhouse test sufficiently against an able-bodied man.

377. Then, before the test-house was created, they did not offer the workhouse to able-bodied men as much, perhaps, as they ought?
Yes; I think they offered the workhouse as far as they could, as long as they had any room; but an idle fellow used to remain in the workhouse then, whereas now he will not remain in the test-house unless he is absolutely destitute.

378. Now that the out-door relief has been diminished, as I understand it to have been, have you any reason to believe that there is any serious complaint among the poor, or among philanthropic people in Birmingham?
I have no means of knowing. It is a mere matter of opinion, but I can only say that there is no place in England where the press is more active, and where political life is more active; and I think that if any hardship had been inflicted upon the poor, the guardians would have been long ago all turned out, and others put in their places. We may assume, therefore, that the ratepayers of the town are satisfied with the way in which relief has been administered, because
because there have been times when there has been great agitation got up in Birmingham with regard to the restriction of outdoor relief, but I think they are satisfied now. There has just been an election of guardians, and the old guardians have been returned; and I think that the people are perfectly satisfied that the deserving poor get better relief than they ever had before in Birmingham, both indoor and outdoor.

379. Though the administration has been stricter?

The undeserving persons are detected now, and therefore they do not receive relief.

380. You said that at one time the amount of medical relief had rather increased, after something which had passed in Parliament about the medical relief; does that increase continue now?

I can hardly judge of that. The guardians and the superintendent relieving officer commented upon it at the time in one of the reports; but it really must rest very much with the officers whether they will allow persons who are not really destitute to receive medical relief.

381. Lord Thring.] I understand you to say that you do not think it objectionable to make the infirmary so comfortable as to attract the poor instead of repelling them?

No; I think if you have a sick man upon your hands the best thing you can do with him is to give him the best possible attention, to cure him and restore him to his work again; but what I do object to is, that persons who ought not to be in the hospital should get in. I have no evidence to offer that they do get in, but I should like to add that the Birmingham guardians feel so strongly upon this matter that, having got a new infirmary, they determined to make every person who comes to this infirmary pass through the large gate, which leads into the workhouse grounds, so that it may not be considered a great State hospital for the town of Birmingham. The person's name will be taken down at the gate, so that those who go into the infirmary will clearly understand that they must not draw a distinction between the workhouse and the infirmary, as people are too apt to do; they will become paupers as they go through the gate.

382. The sick persons who go into the infirmary consider that they are going into a more comfortable sort of workhouse?

I think that the greater proportion of those people do not consider it so. They draw a great distinction between going into the workhouse and going into what is called the infirmary, which is really only a sick ward of the workhouse.

383. Technically the infirmary is the workhouse, but the people, in your opinion, do not consider themselves in the workhouse?

I am sure that they do not consider in their own minds that they are within the workhouse.

384. Supposing that a man is temporarily out of work, would you send him to the test-house?

No; what would be done at Birmingham would be, that the man would get an order for the workhouse in the first instance probably, unless he had been in the test-house over and over again; and he would come before the committee, and they would inquire into his antecedents, and why he was out of work; and if they thought it was a proper case to send to the test-house they would pass him on to the test-house. If, on the other hand, he had only come in for a short time, he would remain in the workhouse until he discharged himself. It is a classification workhouse.

385. I will put it in another form. Do you object to outdoor relief being given to a man who is destitute, but who makes this sort of case, that if he could be allowed to look out for work for a week or so he should be able to support himself? Supposing that a man comes before you, as a guardian, and that the case he makes is this: "I have been suddenly turned out of work owing to misfortune happening to my employer; I am destitute; but if (70.) you
you would give me outdoor relief for a week or so I should be able to find work?
assuming that you believe that to be an honest case, what would you do?
I can hardly say what I should do, because I have not to act as guardian; I
am debarred from acting in individual cases. All I can say is that the guardians
themselves have ample power both under the prohibitory order and under the
out-door relief order to deal with these cases under the exceptions; they can
give out-relief and make a report to the Local Government Board; that is what
is being done at this moment at Manchester. There are certain people whom
they think deserving, and they give them a week's relief to enable them to look
round.

386. Do you not think that this excellent system at Birmingham depends
very much indeed on an extremely close and unusual supervision on the part of
the guardians?
I do entirely.

387. Do you think that it could be extended throughout the kingdom,
or is it only applicable where most meritoriously the guardians pay unusual
attention?
I think all relief of the poor is a thing that requires the most minute possible
attention. You are dealing with men and women, flesh and blood, and you
have to take each individual case; and I do not see how you can relieve the
poor at all without giving the most minute attention to each individual
case.

388. Do you consider the difficulty of making general rules with regard to
out-door relief insuperable, or could you make general rules more uniform?
I think it is of immense advantage to the guardians themselves to have some
principles to guide them, and I think it is also a great advantage to the
poor.

389. Might you not, either by order or by statute, make the rule more
uniform, so that it should not be the case that in two adjoining unions a poor
man may know that in one he can get relief and that in the other he cannot;
would it not be better to make the rule, even if it were a harder rule, more
uniform?
I think you would find that the guardians at present would resist any great
restrictions upon their liberty all over England. They are doing the best they
can in drawing out fresh regulations themselves within their own towns, and
they are prepared to do it; but I think that any order by the Local Government
Board, or any statute restricting relief, would be very much opposed.

390. But looking to the general benefit of the country, and looking to the
fact that it is clear that outdoor relief is in itself objectionable, except in
certain cases, do you not think that it might be limited more, either by statute
or by general order?
No, I do not think so; I think we have gone quite far enough.

391. Earl of Aberdeen.] May we understand that in your opinion such a
code as you have handed in just now goes as far as is practicable in the way of
any special regulation in that matter?
I think that anything beyond that would probably lead to a reaction.

392. Can you tell us whether any systematic co-operation between the
guardians and the charitable societies has been established in Birmingham?
To a very slight extent. Certain cases are referred to a charity organisation,
but it does not amount to very much. When Mr. Chamberlain wrote to the
different boards of guardians to ask what was being done, the clerk to the
guardians of Birmingham said that not the Charity Organisation, but a charity
society that was started temporarily, had taken care of all the cases that ought
not to be relieved by the Poor Law. But that was only a temporary matter.
There is very little, if any, co-operation between the guardians and any charity
organisation.

393. Speaking
393. Speaking generally, are the Birmingham guardians representative of the leading tradesmen in the town or of all classes?
They are the tradesmen of the town. There are 60 guardians, and the overseers are ex-officio guardians; they are men in business in Birmingham.

394. Referring to the test-house, does it to any extent supersede the casual ward?
No, the casual paupers are relieved in the workhouse itself.

395. But the test-house has removed the necessity of the stoneyard for a labour test?
Entirely.

396. Has there been any attempt to set the men to perform work which could be utilised in connection with the workhouse?
Yes, there is an immense amount of work done by the inmates. For instance, the casual poor wheel up the coals from the canal every morning, for the use of the workhouse, and such of the inmates as can do it also assist in wheeling up the coal. A great many of the strong imbeciles assist in this work.

397. But they do not do work on any extended scale in the way of farming or building?
No, there is a considerable amount of land, but with regard to the farming, at the very time that you have the greatest possible pressure upon you in the workhouse, that is in the winter time, you cannot get upon the land; you cannot dig when there is snow or frost, or when it is very wet; but industrial employment is carried as far as possible in the workhouse, and a great amount of wood-cutting is done there by the inmates.

398. With regard to the cottage homes, may I ask whether the system follows pretty closely that which is adopted at the Farninghara Home with which I happen to be well acquainted?
I think it does.

399. Is there a general superintendent?
There is a general superintendent, but no matron. The guardians are determined to have no matron, because they wish to throw the responsibility of each house upon the woman who manages the house; and there is no general wash-house as they have in the other cottage homes, because the guardians did not wish to group those children together, and make them part of one machine. The washing for all the houses is done by each in their own house.

400. And the persons who have charge of each house are regarded as a kind of foster-parents of the children?
Entirely. There is no fixed dietary; they draw a certain amount per week, and so long as they do not overdraw it they are allowed to make the best use of it they can.

401. As to the trades that are taught, is the man who superintends each cottage an artificer who teaches the boy his particular trade?
Yes; there is in the first cottage a gardener; in the next, perhaps, a tinsman; in the next, a painter; in the next, a carpenter, and so on. They are taught the trades that are likely to be useful in Birmingham.

402. And I suppose that the number of cottages is to be extended as required?
Yes; they would have had to extend them very largely, but the Roman Catholics were good enough to take the whole of their children away, and have got them now in orphanages in the neighbourhood of Birmingham.

403. Have they a single chapel, or what is the arrangement as to that?
A large school-room, which has great folding doors, is used as a chapel.

(70.)

404. Earl
404. Earl of Strafford.] Does Miss Mason, the lady inspector, visit and report upon these cottage homes and boarded-out children? Did she visit the boarded-out children, but not the cottage homes?

405. She does not visit the homes near Birmingham?

406. Is that under some separate arrangement between the guardians and the persons in charge of the houses, or why does not Miss Mason exercise her authority there as well as in other parts?

407. How do you think that works; do you think that the fact of this lady being able to visit children, particularly female children, is of advantage, and that she is able to do more than a male inspector would be able to do in the way of making suggestions for the health and comfort of the children?

408. Does she report to you or to the Local Government Board?

409. Is Miss Mason the only lady officially connected with the Local Government Board as an inspector of children?

410. Do you think that that system might with advantage be extended, and that there might be an additional staff of lady inspectors for visiting boarded-out children?

411. She takes the whole of England and Wales?

412. But you think that her work has been of use to the children and to the public?

413. How long has she been in that official capacity?

414. Do you know whether there is any intention of adding another lady or two to her?

415. You think that she is able to do the work that is at present under her care?

416. Earl of Milltown.] I understood you to say that in one year there were 1,083 orders of admission to the workhouse issued, of which only 186 were used, so that that would mean that 897 out of those 1,083 made no use of the orders?

417. Did they obtain no relief whatever?

418. I suppose
418. I suppose there was some inquiry made before the issue of the orders?
Yes. The first thing that a relieving officer has to do is to receive the application for relief. He has then forthwith to visit at the house, and only in case of sudden and urgent necessity himself to give the order; he has to bring the case when fully got up before the relief committee to determine upon. The person generally himself attends, if he is able, before the committee, and states his own case.

419. That makes it still more remarkable, that although that previous inquiry had been made in these cases of 1,083 persons, yet of that number only 186 made use of the orders which were issued to them, leaving 897 apparently unrelieved, who were, at any rate, primâ facie, thought persons deserving of relief?
It is so.

420. Chairman. In all these cases we may presume that full inquiry was made before an order was given for indoor relief, notwithstanding which, a very small per-cent age indeed of the applicants took advantage of the order; is it not a very singular thing that in so large a number of cases the guardians must have been so entirely misled by the information which was furnished to them, and that so very small a number of these applicants really required relief; how do you account for it?
I think it is absolutely impossible in a town to find out what outside means persons may have of living, because we know from inquiries that have been made that living alongside of those applying for relief there are just as many persons who do not apply, but who appear to be equally destitute; and if you take the amount of relief given in most unions of England, you will find that the amount of outdoor relief only represents the amount of rent that the people pay, so that they must have other means of living.

421. Therefore, in point of fact, one may take this large number of refusals as a proof of the great amount of imposture which was sought to be practised upon the guardians?
That is so.

422. Earl of Milltown. What children are those who are placed in these cottage homes.
They are the whole of the children that fall destitute in Birmingham. You can only board out the orphan and deserted children. Therefore, when the guardians at Birmingham constructed these cottages they ceased boarding out, because the orphan and deserted children of course are the very best children, and the only children you can depend upon keeping in a school. The other children are children belonging to people who are constantly going in and out of the workhouse. There are a certain number of women who have illegitimate children who are themselves living in the workhouse, and their children go to school at Mar-ton Green.

423. That is to say, they are children who have been in the workhouse accompanied by their parents.
And orphan and deserted children.

424. I thought you said that orphans and deserted children were boarded out:
No, because they do not board out now at Birmingham. It would absolutely ruin their schools if they boarded out all the orphan and deserted children, and left the people in the cottage homes only with children swept off the streets of Birmingham, who would remain only for two or three or four weeks. These orphan and deserted children leave the whole mass, so that they must keep them in their own schools.

425. Then there is no further boarding out at Birmingham?
No, I think they have a very few remaining.

(70.)

426. All
426. All children who are brought under their supervision are sent to these cottage homes?

Yes.

427. Why did Roman Catholics take their children away?

There were a good many reasons for it. The guardians were extremely liberal there; they paid a Roman Catholic instructor, and did all they could to give the Roman Catholic priests free access to the children. But it was found in practice that if you are putting 150 Roman Catholic children with 350 Protestant children, in afterlife the action of the 350 might have some effect upon the 150. At any rate, the Roman Catholics preferred to have the children entirely under their own care, and the guardians pay them 5s. a week for each child, and they pay the difference; and the Roman Catholic children are all moved now to their own institutions.

428. Then they are paid for still out of the rates?

They are still paid for out of the rates.

429. Lord Balfour.] Not to the full amount?

No, I think the guardians pay 5s. a week for each child to the certified homes. I consider that the children at Marston Green cost about 7s. a week, all included. The guardians would have had to build more homes if the Roman Catholic children had not been taken away, and I think it was a very good offer that the Roman Catholics should take them at 5s.

430. Earl of Milltown.] Is there any supervision over those homes where the Roman Catholic children are?

Yes, they are certified by the Local Government Board, and we inspect them.

431. To the same extent as the others?

No, we go there and satisfy ourselves that the children are properly fed and clothed, and that the cubical and superficial space is sufficient.

432. Under whose management are those schools?

The schools belong to the local authority. Some are run by some ladies, Sisters of Mercy, and the other home is in the country at Colehill, and is also managed by some Sisters of Mercy; but they have some male industrial trainers to look after the boys, and the children go out to school; I think at present to the village school.

433. Those schools are not under official management; they are under a voluntary system?

Yes, they are under a voluntary system. There are a great number of such institutions in England now for every denomination, and the Local Government Board have to inspect them.

434. Earl of Hopetown.] Up to what age are the children kept as a rule in these cottage homes?

The girls go out at about the age of 13. There is an immense demand for girls; the demand is far beyond the supply from Marston Green. The boys sometimes remain a little longer, till they are 14, so that they may get a little proficient in their trade; but you may take 14 as about the age, unless there is anything physically or mentally deficient in them.

435. Are any means taken to keep them away from the bad influence of their former companions when they go out of these homes?

This home is nine miles from Birmingham, and there is no opportunity of people coming to see them, except their own relatives, and they have a right to come.

436. But afterwards, when they go out into their trades, is any supervision exercised over them at all?

Yes, every child who goes out from either a workhouse or one of these district schools, so long as it remains in the union, in the first place is looked after by the relieving officer; but the Birmingham board of guardians have a special mode
mode of looking after them; some ladies have undertaken to look after them, and they send in a report to the guardians, which I have here, showing, as far as they can find out, the result of the training upon them.

437. Chairman. Is there any special regulation at Birmingham with regard to outdoor relief in the case of women in child-birth?

No.

438. How are they dealt with?

They are dealt with in the lying-in ward of the workhouse.

439. My question refers to this: A woman, I will assume, is actually confined of a child, and then the husband makes application for relief, saying that he has not enough to provide her with necessaries, and so forth; do you know whether there is any rule as to granting relief in such cases?

No, the relieving officer would certainly give relief if the man were destitute.

440. They have not seen their way to making the rule which has been made in some unions, that in no case, unless there is some extraordinary medical difficulty which requires the attendance of a skilled medical officer, shall any relief be given?

No.

441. With regard to the test-house, would you explain what is the difference between the treatment of an able-bodied pauper in the test-house and the treatment of an able-bodied pauper who is allowed to remain in the workhouse?

I have always found great difficulty in knowing why these people disliked the test-house so much, because it is really no more nor less than the old country workhouse with whitewashed walls and fair diet; but it is confinement and labour, and they are kept apart from all other classes, and they dislike that.

442. Do you mean that in the Birmingham Workhouse the able-bodied paupers are allowed to mix with other classes?

They are supposed to be kept apart, but they more or less drift in with the partially disabled who are classed as able-bodied; and there are greater indulgences allowed in the workhouse than would be allowed in the test house. Among the aged and infirm men the dietary is better, and the work is not so hard.

443. Is it in accordance with the regulations of the Local Government Board that men classed as able-bodied should mix with the aged and infirm?

It is almost impossible to define what an able-bodied man is in a large workhouse. The old idea was that no man under 60 should be classed as an aged and infirm man; but now there are very few able-bodied men in any workhouse. If you take the number that are classed as able-bodied you would find that they really are not able-bodied, but that they are partially disabled men; and in the large workhouses they have not the means now of classifying or sufficiently testing really able-bodied men if they came in there.

444. Are they not guided by the report of their medical officer, if there is any doubt?

Yes, that is their duty.

445. Is it a very difficult matter indeed to determine whether a man is fit to perform ordinary labour or not?

They have not got in those workhouses wards to place these people in. They have been pushed out of the wards by the pressure of the other classes of aged and infirm.

446. Do you not think that that is a very vicious system indeed?

Yes, and we are trying to alter it.
447. Do you know whether they allow any tobacco in the workhouse to these so-called able-bodied men?
    No, I should say not at the test-house.

448. But do they allow it in the workhouse?
    Not except on the order of the medical officer.

449. Do you think that those orders are at all freely given?
    No, I do not think so in Birmingham.

450. Is it not the fact that there are a great number of orphans who are placed in homes in the different parts of England for various reasons in the same way as those orphans are placed in the Roman Catholic homes?
    Yes.

451. Is it not at all peculiar to Birmingham or to the Roman Catholics?
    No.

452. When they are placed in such homes the supervision is confined to ascertaining that the homes are properly conducted, is it not?
    That is so.

453. You were asked whether it would be possible to make regulations securing more uniformity in the practice of giving relief, and you answered that you did not think so; that answer of yours applied principally, I suppose, to populous places and towns; or would you apply it generally?
    I do not think that in country places you can go beyond the prohibitory order.

454. In point of fact, the prohibitory order does apply some very strict general rules, does it not?
    It does.

455. And you do not think that it would be desirable or possible to apply such strict general rules to populous places?
    I am sure it would not.

456. With regard generally to the laying down of very strict regulations, is it not necessary that the guardians should take into consideration in all cases the particular circumstances of the population, the practice which had prevailed as to relief, and, to a certain extent, to guide themselves by those particular circumstances, so as to avoid any reaction arising from too strict and sudden an enforcement of regulations which might be otherwise healthy?
    That is so.

457. And for that reason it is necessary to leave considerable latitude to the guardians?
    It is.

458. Lord Balfour.] You put in these regulations which are in existence at Birmingham, as showing what the system in Birmingham is at the present time?
    Yes.

459. But not necessarily to recommend them as models for other places, for which they might not be suitable?
    Not at all, but only as showing what has been done at Birmingham. Perhaps the Committee will allow me to say one thing with regard to the Birmingham Workhouse, and that is as to the discontinuance of stimulants in the workhouse since 1874. Stimulants and extras before that time were administered very freely indeed, not only to sick persons, but, under the recommendation of the medical officers, to persons in respect of work and really in the shape of reward for work. In 1874 there were 204 persons receiving beer in respect of labour in the workhouse, not because they were sick, but on account of labour. In 1883, which is the date of the last return that I have, there was not one; the whole of that was discontinued. There were 190 persons in 1874 receiving extra diet
460. **Chairman.** Is the diet in the test-house for able-bodied men the same as in the workhouse?

No.

461. Is it a more severe diet in the test-house?

It is a very good dietary, but I cannot tell you whether it is better or worse than the dietary in the workhouse. It is, however, so good a dietary that when we were considering what would be the best dietary for the able-bodied men in the Lancashire workhouses, the Lancashire guardians did not adopt it.

462. Earl of Milltown. What was the extra diet given for?

It was given for work. The dietary is fixed by the guardians by the order of the Local Government Board. Then the medical officer can recommend to the guardians any person who he may think may require stimulants for any particular work that he may be doing; and the guardians may sanction extra diet for the performance of any particular work in the workhouse. That has led to great abuse; in the workhouses, because handy men have really been bribed to remain in the workhouse to make themselves useful to the master, and do work for him; and the effect of striking off the beer and the meat at dinner has been that they have discharged themselves from the workhouse.

463. Earl of Aberdeen. I think you mentioned that the fact of a number of the orders for the house having been made no use of, pointed to a good deal of attempted imposition?

Yes.

464. Must it be attributed entirely to imposture, or is it not in many cases due to the intense dislike of respectable working people to enter the house, which would lead them to endure almost any privation rather than resort to that relief?

That would be very true in the country; but there is certainly not that dislike in the towns to entering the workhouse at present.

465. Even on the part of the respectable working people?

Yes.

466. Lord Balfour. What we have been calling, for the purpose of convenience, the Liverpool Group, comprises the parish of Liverpool, the West Derby Union, and the Toxteth Park Township, does it not?

Yes.

467. In 1881 the population of the parish of Liverpool was 210,164, was it not?

That was so.

468. And it had decreased in the previous 10 years by the number of 25,129, had it not?

Yes.

469. But the density of the population still remained at 85 persons to the acre?

Yes.

470. The West Derby Union joins the parish of Liverpool, does it not?

Yes.

471. That union had a population in 1881 of 359,273, or an increase in the previous 10 years of 102,190?

Yes.

(70.)

472. There...
472. These changes in the population make the task of foreseeing what will be required a few years hence extremely difficult in such districts as that, do they not?

It is so.

473. As a matter of fact, at the present time, Liverpool is deficient in accommodation, but as the population will, probably, in the course of a few years decrease, it is rather the West Derby Union that should be expected to provide additional accommodation than the Liverpool Union, is it not?

It is.

474. There is a good deal of difficulty in getting the ratepayers to see that, is there not?

Very great, indeed.

475. I suppose we may say that however well managed a district is, it is almost certain to be a poor district if the population is very dense to the acre?

Certainly. The richer people dwell outside of the parish or district.

476. Therefore, if you see in statistics that the population is very dense to the acre, you may be sure that problems affecting pauperism are very pressing ones in that district?

Yes.

477. In this group relief is administered under the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order, is it not?

Yes; Liverpool has itself a select vestry elected in the usual way of select vestries, with a guardian qualification of 50 l. The other unions are administered under the general law.

478. What action has been taken by the guardians to secure uniformity of relief for able-bodied men, with or without families?

This short statement, I think, will put it before you: “The experience of the last two winters having convinced Mr. Henley, Local Government Board Inspector of the district, of the existence of serious evils in connection with the working of the labour test yards of the three Liverpool Poor Law areas, and being of opinion that these evils are greatly aggravated by the fact that each yard is managed altogether independently of the other two, Mr. Henley was induced to convene a meeting of representatives from the three districts of Liverpool, Toxteth Park, and West Derby, for the purpose of considering the expediency and the practicability of securing uniformity in the management of the yards. Each Board sent representatives to the conference. Several meetings were held, and the proceedings were generally marked by unanimity. As to the desirability of bringing into harmony the practice of the three boards in the administration of relief to able-bodied poor (both out-door and in-door) there was absolutely no difference of opinion, and regulations for the management of this class were agreed upon and are appended hereto. The only point upon which any great diversity of opinion was shown, was as to the necessity of keeping the labour yards open during ordinary seasons. The opinion of Mr. Henley (an opinion which was ultimately adopted by the conference) is that the labour yards should be open only during periods of abnormal pressure; and that, under ordinary circumstances, and particularly during the summer months, able-bodied poor requiring relief should be relieved in the workhouse only. The conference passed a resolution to the effect that it is expedient to abandon the out-door labour test unless such pressure is felt in any one of the three districts as to justify its application, in which case notice should be given to the other two districts. As the rigid application of the workhouse test in ordinary seasons may result in some increase of the numbers of in-door able-bodied poor, the conference proceeded to inquire how far, with existing workhouse accommodation, the complete separation of this class from other classes of inmates, and the enforcing of test labour, can be carried out. The conference were unanimously of opinion that, with the present workhouse, most desirable ends cannot be secured, and the necessity was admitted of
of providing especial accommodation for this class. This has been done with
great advantage in the metropolis and in Birmingham, and the conference are
satisfied that the making of similar provision in Liverpool would be attended
with the best results. There would be an obvious advantage in having one
house for the use of the three districts, and the present conference see no
difficulties but such as may easily be overcome, in the way of the necessary
 provision being made by the joint action of the three boards. The regulations
agreed upon for the relief and management of the able-bodied poor are
appended hereto."

479. What is the date of that?
This is dated 1887.

480. What were the circumstances which led to the necessity of calling
together such a conference?
There were a great number of people walking about the streets of Liverpool,
following very much upon the agitation which had taken place in London.
Many of those persons were clamouring for work, and not for relief. There was
nothing in the shape of rioting, but there was a good deal of discontent, and
they tried to force upon the guardians the idea that they were entitled to work,
and not to relief, that they were not to be pauperised by it.

481. Have you any experience to guide you as to what had given rise to that
idea?
No; I can only form an opinion from the mode of relief that had been
employed in those three districts, and that was what is called the labour-yard.
The persons were sent to work in a stone-yard, and they might, very naturally,
argue that, as they were required there to do a certain amount of test labour,
the guardians would provide work for them, and not relief. In one of the
unions at least they were paid for the results of their labour, so much a barrow
load of stones, and they were not relieved according to the necessities of their
family, and a task of work enforced against them simply to test them. The
result was, that these people had it in their minds that the guardians were to
provide work for them, and not relief. I also found that some of those persons
have been in the habit of being in the labour yard winter after winter. One
man, in particular, had been there 16 or 17 years, and he had evidently looked
to it as his resource for winter work. They were a very difficult class to deal
with. They were men who worked on the quays at Liverpool, and went there
in the morning to endeavour to get work there, and failing to get work there,
they came to the yard. In the result of this conference, at which Mr. Rathbone
was kind enough to take the chair on the first occasion, the guardians agreed
that they would endeavour, as far as possible, to secure uniformity in Liverpool,
and they have since agreed to combine together West Derby and Liverpool,
for the purpose of erecting a house similar, to the one they have at Birming-
ham.

482. So far as you know, that action has been approved by the ratepayers in
the district?
Certainly it has, because elections have taken place and all the leading newspa-
rpapes have supported the idea of the test-house, and the labour-yards have not
been worked, with very few exceptions, at Liverpool during the whole of this
winter. In the West Derby Union they have not opened them at all.

483. Are there any other points with regard to these three unions that you
would like to bring before the Committee?
I think not.

484. Earl of Aberdeen.] Do you know whether the system as to the casual
ward in Liverpool is similar to that in London?
No; in London you have one system over the whole metropolis, but in the
new scheme which they have in Liverpool the casual poor will be relieved in the
same place as the test-house; so that the Liverpool people hope they will get
the same powers as they have in London with regard to detention, if necessary.
They hope to have one ward for the whole of the town, with the exception of
Toxteth Park.
485. Did I correctly understand you to say that they hoped to have a casual 
ward in connection with the test-house?
They intend to build it. They have not got it at Birmingham, but they 
tend at Liverpool and West Derby to provide vagrant wards, casual wards in 
connection with their test-house, in some central place.

486. What is the present system in Liverpool?
The present system in Liverpool is that they are relieved at the different 
workhouses, at the West Derby and the Liverpool and the Toxteth Park work-
houses.

487. That is to say, there is a ward for the casual applicants?
There are wards for men and wards for women.

488. And a task of work is assigned, I presume?
Yes; the orders are strictly enforced.

489. Lord Balfour. We come next to what we call the Manchester group, 
which comprises the Manchester Township, the Salford Union, the Chorlton 
Union, and the Prestwich Union?
Yes.

490. In Manchester, the population in 1881 was 148,000, and the decrease 
in the preceding 10 years was 25,000, but the density of population to the acre 
was still 90?
Yes, that is so.

491. The population in the other unions has been increasing, and the same 
problems as to provision of accommodation come into consideration in this 
group as in the group which you have just mentioned?
Yes.

492. Has there been any endeavour there to get concerted action between 
the boards of guardians?
Yes, following upon the Liverpool plan, the guardians of those four unions 
agreed to meet, and they agreed to resolutions almost identical with the Liver-
pool resolutions, with this exception: that they would not pledge themselves to 
have any joint action with regard to closing the labour-yard. However, as a 
matter of fact, the labour-yards have been closed during the whole of this 
winter. They have not, at the present time, come to any resolution about 
building a joint house, but, as a matter of fact, two of the unions have ample 
accommodation in their workhouses for able-bodied men at this time, and they 
will, I think, if necessary, take in the able-bodied from the other work-
houses.

493. But there is, as I understand, among those boards of guardians, the 
same feeling with regard to the extreme inexpediency of the labour-yard, unless 
under circumstances of great emergency?
I think they have come now to that conclusion.

494. They have come to that conclusion after experience extending over a 
series of years of the evil effects of the labour-yard?
Yes, and I perhaps might add to that, that in consequence of not having the 
labour-yard open, the Manchester guardians, and the other guardians, but 
especially the Manchester guardians, have felt it necessary this winter to give a 
certain amount of relief for a short period, say for a week, to a man and his 
wife and several children, so as to give the man an opportunity of trying to get 
work. They have done that to some extent, and they think it far preferable to 
having a place where the people can always look to to get work in the winter 
whenever they require it.

495. With regard to the difficult problem of how to deal with men tempo-
arily out of work, the Manchester board of guardians promulgated a set of 
rules which were favourably quoted by the Local Government Board in 1878, 
I believe?
Yes; I hand in a copy of those rules (handing in the same).

496. Can
496. Can you state what was the essential feature of those rules differing from the previous practice?

I think they were about the first, and almost every board of guardians has adopted rules something similar to those within the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order. Under those rules, certain persons were not to receive outdoor relief, but were to receive relief in the workhouse only. Although the Manchester guardians' rules are most excellent, Manchester appears in this Table of mine to be in a worse position than most of the other unions in Lancashire with regard to their pauperism; but the real fact is that the density of the population is so great that they have to deal with the poor in the middle of Manchester, while their more fortunate neighbours outside have to deal with a better class of persons. It might otherwise appear that although they have these regulations, they have not adhered to them, looking at the result of these tables.

497. With regard to the question of men temporarily out of work, and the hardship of obliging them to go to the workhouse, may it be said, speaking generally, that those who are placed in that position are almost invariably those who have been improvident and careless of their future?

I could hardly go so far as to say that, I think. Those who apply for relief, as a rule, probably would be of that class; but in very large towns like Manchester, and Liverpool, and Birmingham, there must be a very large number of persons who are thrown out of work, especially in such times as we have had during the last few years, without any fault of their own at all.

498. Do you find that subscriptions to benefit clubs and medical societies are at all general in the districts of which you are now speaking?

With regard to those who come for relief, so far as benefit societies are concerned in the towns, I hardly ever find a person who is a member of a benefit society. Throughout the five days on which the Committee sat at Birmingham a short time ago, I asked every one who came in, and there was not one of them who at that time belonged to any benefit society. But the figures and statistics show that benefit societies and clubs are enormously used in large towns. Those who came upon the rates unfortunately did not belong to them.

499. Does it not point, at any rate, in the direction of the question which I just asked, that those who do come upon the rates when they are temporarily out of work are those who have taken no care to provide against such an emergency?

I think you may say so generally; but at the same time there are a great number of the poor with very large families who find it extremely difficult in hard times to keep up their payments, and so they drop off the clubs.

500. You have no experience or figures to give us to show how many of those who you think would subscribe to benefit societies, have been so subscribing, and have failed to continue from the causes which you mention?

I have no figures, and I do not think in the towns it would amount to very much; but in the country districts there is an immense number of persons that have belonged to clubs, and have intended to make provision, but the clubs have failed. In towns, however, I seldom find that those who come for relief are members of any benefit society.

501. Is there any exceptional pressure in Lancashire at the present time on account of the large works in connection with the Manchester Ship Canal and otherwise?

It certainly has had a tendency to increase the number of vagrants. That is the only effect of it at present. A great number of persons have come from all parts of England, some hoping to get employment and others to see what is going on.

502. Speaking from your experience, extending over a considerable district of country, should you say that there was anything to establish a common belief that the agricultural population being thrown out of work in the country is tending to migrate to the large towns?

No, my experience certainly does not tend in that direction at all. I have seen a great many statements that the agricultural labourers have tended to swell (70.)
the mass of the unemployed in the towns. I know nothing of London; I can only speak of the large towns in my district. With regard to Lancashire it would not be very likely in such a population as that we should see much of agricultural labourers, with the exception of some from Cheshire. North of the Ribble, which is to some extent an agricultural district certainly, neither the farmers nor the labourers have suffered at all; they have not felt the pressure that has been felt elsewhere. But I particularly asked the superintendent of outdoor relief at Birmingham, taking the last three years, whether he had observed any number of agricultural labourers coming into the towns and swelling the number of the unemployed. Warwickshire has certainly been one of the most distressed agricultural parts of England.

503. Might they come into the towns and get work to the exclusion of the town population, and so throw more of the town population upon the relieving officers, and not themselves actually come much in contact with the relieving officers?

There is no doubt that, taking the year 1879 as the first year of great distress in the agricultural districts, for a few years prior to that there had been a very large depletion of the agricultural population into the towns; but they went there not to swell the mass of the unemployed, but to get employment in the towns. Everyone knows that it was extremely difficult to keep young and strong people in the country at that time. What you have said is, no doubt, true to a certain extent, that having stronger and better constitutions as a rule they have, to some extent, displaced a certain number of the weak men in the towns who may be out of employment; but to say that the agricultural population are walking about the towns with spades on their shoulders joining the unemployed, I believe is a pure fiction, so far as any town of which I know anything is concerned; and if you look at the Return of the No. 3 District, the district which contains three purely agricultural counties, Berks, Bucks, and Oxon, Berks has only one town, viz., Reading, in it. You will find that if there had been any very great distress among the agricultural labourers it must have been felt upon the poor rate. On 1st January 1877 there were 7,796 persons receiving indoor and outdoor relief in Berkshire, and in 1887 there were only 7,030. In Bucks there were 6,540 in 1877, and 5,423 in 1887. In Oxfordshire there were 7,527 in 1877, and 6,681 in 1887. Therefore, looking at that, and looking at the other circumstances which I have mentioned, I cannot believe that the theory of the agricultural labourers drifting into towns to swell the unemployed has any foundation at all, or to any great extent. I have asked the masters of the workhouses with regard to admissions into the vagrant wards, and they cannot tell me that there has been any greater number of men who describe themselves as labourers than there were before.

504. What is the provision in the districts which you know best for the accommodation of vagrants?

The vagrants are dealt with in three ways. First of all, there is the cellular system, which is very much in vogue and fashion now, which is, in fact, putting up cells in the different workhouses. Secondly, there are the ordinary bunk beds, which is called the associated accommodation. Thirdly, you have the hammocks. The accommodation is extremely humble, but probably it is sufficient for the class of men who come into the vagrant wards.

505. It would be upon that class that any pressure which would arise from exceptional work, such as the Manchester Ship Canal, would be felt, would it not?

Certainly.

506. Is there any evidence of that in Lancashire at the present time?

Yes, there is some increase in the number of vagrants who have come into the workhouses. There were 386 on the 1st of January 1878, and on the 1st of January 1888 there were 484, a slight increase. But the only thing that surprises me is the extremely small number of vagrants that occupy the workhouses in England and Wales. It really amounts to nothing.

507. Is
507. Is the number increasing?

It has gone up and down. I think the greatest number that there has been is 7,020 (on 1st January 1869), and it has now gone down to about 5,620 (on 1st January 1888), in England and Wales.

508. What were the provisions of the Act known as Mr. Pell's Act?

Before Mr. Pell's Act was passed a person was detained until eleven o'clock in the day, and was compelled to perform a task of work. The vagrants themselves complained, and I think justly, that they were kept in such an hour that they could not go upon a day's journey or look for work. Therefore Mr. Pell's Act was passed upon the principle that a man should remain in the workhouse, and do what every other labourer has to do, a day's work for his day's lodging and his day's food, and with this great advantage to himself, that he could be discharged the next morning at an earlier hour. In almost all the country unions at any rate, and in many of the town unions, they passed resolutions allowing these men to discharge themselves as soon as they had had their breakfast in the morning; that is to say, at seven o'clock in the summer and at eight o'clock in the winter.

509. You told us that applicants for relief in our towns are seldom members of benefit clubs; when they are, what is your opinion as to the propriety of regarding their allowance from the club, or any part of it, as income to be taken into consideration in giving relief?

Strictly speaking, no doubt it ought to be taken into consideration as income. I know very little of it in towns; but certainly in country districts they generally allow a man half.

510. Your experience as to the practice coincides with that of Sir Hugh Owen, whose evidence you heard the other day?

Yes, he put in a summary, I think, about that. My experience in country unions is that they are generally what is commonly called liberally treated; and if one man had not provided for himself, and another man had provided for himself, it would make all the difference in giving out your relief to the man.

511. It is your experience that the guardians make a more liberal provision for those who have tried to help themselves?

They do, certainly.

512. And you approve of that;

Yes, I do; but they should treat it as income, and add to that sum what is sufficient to maintain him, and no more.

513. Have you any means of knowing whether there is much distress amongst the non-pauper population; those who are on the verge of pauperism, but who do not actually apply for relief in any one district?

It does not come within my duties to inquire into it, except in so far as this: that if I find a number of people out of employment in a town, I have, so far as I possibly can, to ascertain whether there is likely to be any great pressure upon the Poor Law authorities, and to advise them accordingly. When these people were walking about the streets of Manchester and Liverpool I did make some inquiries about it; and there is one gentleman (I do not know whether your Lordships will have him before you or not, a guardian of a union) who has made it his business to make special inquiry among the class who do not apply for relief; his name is Mr. McDougall, junior, of Manchester. He took, in the first instance, the callings of those who were applying for non-pauper school fees, as likely to be the best evidence of those who were in great poverty, and yet were not destitute, but who were applying for relief. But he found in practice that the school fees were not distributed in towns upon a common principle, and therefore he had to extend his inquiries further, and perhaps the Committee will permit me to read a letter which I had from him at that time which will explain what he found; it is dated 13th February 1886:

"Core House, Greenhuns, Manchester.—I have only got through the preliminary work necessary for the inquiries bearing upon poverty in Manchester apart from pauperism; but from information I have gathered in all parts of the town, I am convinced
convinc ed that there is a very large number of persons in a worse condition as regards income than the average applicants for Poor Law relief, and who could not be refused relief in some shape if they did apply. I have for some time been convinced of this from hearing the cases of applicants for school fees both in Manchester township and the Chorlton Union; but I have gone beyond the facts that come to my notice as a guardian and visited many families in great poverty, from whom no application to any public charity is made at all. I have endeavoured to get at the truth on three points: 1. How families can exist in moderate health on incomes of average, say five persons (say two adults and three children) at 1s. 9d. per head per week. 2. Why do many such families not apply for Poor Law relief? 3. What is a fair estimate of the number of such families in the town? So far as I can form an opinion, existence is only possible in consequence of the low price of bread and other provisions, and the help that is given by relatives in work at regular employments, and some, though not much, assistance given by persons visiting from religious and other institutions. The main help comes from relatives and neighbours. The low price of bread enables those in full work to be generous in giving food. I am certain that if food had been dear there would now be a condition of distress in the town that could only be met by relief measures of a public kind. Rent is also much more moderate than a few years ago, when employment was more abundant. With regard to the second point, I am glad to find a very strong aversion to seeking Poor Law relief; principally on the ground of a desire not to be known as paupers. This does not arise in any great extent from an idea of hard usage or unwillingness on the part of the guardians to relieve, but a wish to be independent of pauperism. I have the greatest difficulty in attempting to form a correct opinion of the numbers of persons in a state of sharp poverty. The numbers of the applicants for school fees supply no data for calculation, as many more children are admitted free to Board schools, and at several denominational schools children are admitted free for a time, or fees are paid by members of congregations for them; and there are many adults in a distressed condition who have no children of school age dependent upon them. For the year 1884 I was able, I think, very nearly to state the proportion of the pauper class to population; that is, of persons either actually receiving Poor Law relief, or likely to apply for it from having previously done so, viz., 9.78 as the per-centage of persons actually paupers or likely to become so. But I entirely fail to arrive at a reliable per-centage of the very poor persons whose means are as scanty as the average pauper in the population. I can only state my conviction that the numbers have largely increased during 1885, and that there are now in Manchester a large number of persons in very poor circumstances." That is dated February 1886, just at the time of the last pressure in Manchester. Mr. McDougall's conclusion is, that there are fully as many persons who are quite as destitute, and who do not apply for relief, as those living alongside of them, who apply for relief. He gives excellent reasons, I think, why these people do not apply. These people fortunately do not wish to give up their feelings of independence, and they do not wish to be herded among the pauper class.

514. You would be unwilling to do anything to break down that feeling until it was absolutely necessary that those people should apply for relief?

Most certainly; everything should be done to prevent them applying.

515. In your district I understand that the amount of the school fees is, especially at present, an unsafe test of the amount of distress, because there has been a considerable relaxation amongst the guardians of the rules under which they give this free education, has there not?

That is so, especially at Liverpool, and the Birmingham guardians are following it. In practice they allow the School Board to promise payment at any rate, and they pay the bill eventually. The school fees have largely increased. There is no basis to go upon as to a state of absolute destitution in a town. Their object is to assist the School Board in getting the children into the schools.

516. Is
516. Is there any connection or concerted action in any part of your district between the guardians and the Charity Organisation Society, and its branches?

There is very little. Both at Manchester and at Liverpool persons are referred to the Charity Organisation Society or to other societies which administer charity among the people; but it does not amount to very much. The only place where there has been really an honest attempt to take off the hands of the guardians all persons who ought not to be receiving Poor Law relief is at Oxford. There has lately been a great reaction against that, however, headed by the Member for the city. He considered that too little out-door relief was given in the town, and he has taken rather a hostile action to the gentlemen who have been organising the relief principally members of the University. For some few years the out-door relief has very much decreased there, and they have taken upon themselves to relieve a certain number of persons who they did not think ought to come on the poor rates at all.

517. Do you wish to make any recommendation with regard to that class of paupers whom I described to Sir Hugh Owen the other day as "in and outers"?

No question. I think, has been more disturbing to boards of guardians than the question of persons who are going in and out of workhouses. Many letters have been written to the Local Government Board about it. We have really nothing to recommend in the matter. We cannot tell the relieving officer not to let them go in between the meetings of the guardians, because he acts independently of the guardians, and he is obliged to give orders for admission to destitute persons in cases of urgent necessity. The North Western Conference this year passed resolutions to memorialise the Local Government Board to give greater powers of detention. No action has been taken upon that, and I do not suppose for a moment that the House of Commons would listen to any greater powers of detention being granted. We should have the cry of "The Bastille" raised again, as it was raised about 40 years ago.

518. They have a more drastic system in America, have they not?

In New York a person comes up before an officer who administers out-relief and he states his case, and the officer tells him: "We have only one system here for the able-bodied men, and that is that we take you into our poor-house for three months; we do not want you to come in at all, but if you cannot get on without it we will give you a ticket to come into the poor-house; but you must endorse this ticket and say that you commit yourself to the poor-house for three months," and the man endorses the ticket at the back and commits himself to the poor-house for three months.

519. I understand that you do not recommend that system; but you simply state that that is the practice in America?

I certainly do not recommend it; I am not in favour of it; I believe it would be perfectly impracticable.

520. Earl of Milltown.] The system which you have spoken of only applies, I suppose, to able-bodied applicants?

Only with regard to able-bodied men.

521. Chairman] What are the exact conditions under which that order is enforced in the United States?

It is only in New York. Each State has its own laws. The inmates of the workhouses are of two classes, persons committed for offences and paupers self-committed from destitution. The process of self-commitment is as follows: Upon the application of an able-bodied person, he is required, as a condition of relief, to endorse an order for admission to the workhouse, thus committing himself.
self for a period, which is generally three months. The following is a copy of the form of commitment:

The Superintendent of the workhouse will receive C——- R———, native of U. S. who stands committed to the workhouse for three months.


Department of Public Charities and Correction, New York.

187 .

(signed) A—— B——
Commissioner of Public Charities and Correction.

(Endorsement.)
I hereby consent to the within commitment.
(signed) C—— R——.

Though the commitment is for a definite period, I was informed that the Commissioners almost invariably discharge a self committed pauper who is fortunate enough to obtain employment.

522. Earl Spencer.] What is the number of men who commit themselves in that way in New York in the course of a year? I could not answer that question. There was a considerable number of persons in the poorhouse when I visited it. There is no out-relief at all given in New York at the present moment; they have discontinued that entirely; it is only a system of indoor relief. They have got the whole of the charitable organisations in New York embodied together, and they have offices there where people can get relief.

523. Lord Balfour.] Do you approve of the system of giving out-door relief in supplement to and in respect of contributions by the relatives of the person relieved?
I think that, in the first instance, the family should be required to take charge of the person; but it is often absolutely impossible to do so, their relatives being scattered all over the country. I think it is the duty of the guardians, then to enforce the legal obligations against any member of the family who can possibly pay, because the family ought to provide for their relative before the public is called upon to do so. There is a difficulty, of course, as to brothers and sisters and uncles and aunts, inasmuch as you have no legal obligation against them, and all you can do is to let them know that if they do not take charge of the person, or contribute to his maintenance, he will be removed to the workhouse.

524. What I meant was not the granting of relief which was recovered from the relatives; but there are some who advocate, instead of offering the poorhouse as a test of destitution, that inasmuch as the poorhouse costs so many shillings a week to the ratepayers, a contribution should be asked from the relatives and supplemented from the rates; I want to get your experience upon that point. Those people would receive out-door relief in respect of their relations making up some part of an adequate maintenance.
Then the relief given would be inadequate if the rest were to be supplemented by relations. That is done in a great many cases.

525. What is your opinion of that as a matter of policy? I think upon the whole it is certainly right, because the guardians have no
power, and they have no right to give relief beyond the necessities of the case; and if you found that the family were providing so much you would only have to supplement it out of the rates The poor people themselves, I may add, do not like that system, because they think that the guardians’ payment is a more certain one, and they would rather that the guardians acted as their agents to get the money from the relatives. The recipients of the relief would rather receive the whole sum from the guardians.

26. Out of doors?

Out-relief.

527. Is that a wise policy for boards of guardians to pursue, or will it have the tendency to educate people into relying upon that, and expecting to get it, and not having to go into the workhouse before they obtain relief?

Those are cases as I understand that would not go into the workhouse, but cases of old people probably receiving out-door relief. It is a question whether you make up from the rates the amount that the family contribute, and make the family pay it direct to the pauper, or whether you give adequate relief to the pauper, and receive from the relatives the amount which you have agreed upon.

528. Then, are we to understand that your recommendation of that system is confined to the cases of aged people?

I certainly would not give it to able-bodied people, but only to the aged or sick.

529. Have you anything to say as regards the provision of stimulants in the workhouses in your district?

I have already mentioned, I think that, with regard to the sick poor, it is a medical question entirely, and it is impossible to interfere with the discretion of the medical officer as to the treatment of his patients; but with regard to giving stimulants for the performance of labour, very little of that goes on in Lancashire at all, and it has been very much reduced. The difference in the amount of stimulants given in the workhouses is something very striking indeed. This is taken from the Parliamentary Return, which, I dare say, you have had before you. I find that in some workhouses there is no stimulant at all given to the sick, in others it goes up from 4 d. to as much as 4 s. 5 d. for the year; that is per head for the whole number of inmates in a particular workhouse. The practice is extremely different, but I do not see that the guardians or anyone would have power to restrict it, because it is a medical question, and if a medical man thinks that his patients require stimulants, he must give them to them.

530. Earl of Aberdeen. With regard to that system which Lord Balfour referred to of supplementing the assistance of relatives by help from the rates, are we to understand that you would not approve of it except in the case of aged persons or sickness?

Able-bodied persons ought, in my opinion, to be relieved only in the workhouse.

531. Would it not on principle apply equally in the case of workmen who are shut out from their employment, in the time of a frost, for instance?

No, I am afraid I could not agree to that, because it would very soon come to using the rates in all of wages.

532. You think that that would be objectionable?

Yes.

533. Earl of Milltown. With regard to these benefit clubs, how much a week do the men usually pay to them on an average?

That I can hardly tell you; the payments are very various. Some of the clubs give only relief in cases of sickness; there are clubs in existence now which grant deferred annuities, and they vary very much. Some of the sick clubs include a man’s whole family. Without figures before me I could not give a proper answer to that question.

534. I suppose it is a substantial sum in a good many cases, considering the amount of wages that the man would probably be earning?

Yes, it is a considerable per centage on his wages, undoubtedly.

(70.)
535. So that it would be no sign of improvidence on the part of a working man that he did not belong to one of these clubs, supposing him to have a large family, for instance?

I think they could almost all of them, unless they had an exceptionally large family, belong to an ordinary sick club. To the club which is most required, namely, a club for deferred annuities to provide for them in old age, I do not think that they all could belong.

536. That was the kind of clubs to which my noble friend was alluding in one of his questions, in which he seemed rather to indicate that the fact of their not belonging to these benefit clubs might be taken as *prima facie* evidence that they were not very deserving persons?

I am unable to go further with the town clubs, for I know nothing about them.

537. With regard to the vagrant wards, I understood you to say that in the country districts they are not managed, as a rule, on the cellular principle?

In some country districts they are.

538. But not as a rule?

Yes. I should think there is quite an equal number of cellular wards in my district as of associated wards.

539. It would be very desirable, would it not, that they should all be managed on that system?

No two people agree as to what is the best system. A few years ago, everyone was in favour of these cellular wards; but now I think they are rather tired of the great cost of them, and they wish they had never constructed them.

540. We understood from Sir Hugh Owen on the last day that we met, that the cellular principle was that generally adopted now in the metropolis, and one of which he approved?

Yes.

541. What constitutes a vagrant?

A man who is casually destitute within the district. We ought not to call him a vagrant.

542. I was rather struck by the statement in the letter which you read, that in Manchester there is as large a number of persons in an equally destitute state who do not apply for relief as of those who do apply for relief?

That is the opinion of Mr. M'Dougall.

543. And yet I suppose, relief is only given to those who are really destitute?

Relief is only given to those who apply first of all, and to those who are really destitute. It is not the business of the guardians to go and hunt for destitution; they have to wait until a person applies to them.

544. That would mean, would it not, that there is a very considerable number of persons in an absolute state of destitution in Manchester, who receive no relief whatever?

That is so.

545. *Chairman.* Can it be the fact that they are persons in an absolute state of destitution, because, if so, they must starve; do you not rather mean that they are in a relative condition of destitution?

They are equally poor with those who receive relief.

546. The word "destitute" hardly means what is intended, because if a man is destitute, he must starve?

I should have said equally poor.

547. Earl of Miltown. I was rather under the impression that those who apply for relief as destitute and obtain it would, unless they did so obtain relief, starve?

I do
I do not think that would follow. There is such abundant charity among the poor themselves, and among their neighbours, that I think it would be extremely hard to find in the large towns any persons actually starved to death.

548. Earl of Aberdeen.] They would get charity probably from their next-door neighbours, almost but not quite as poor as themselves?

Yes, there is abundant charity.

549. Earl of Hopetown.] Do you think that the vagrants are in the habit of picking and choosing the workhouse they will go to?

Yes, I have not the least doubt that they are in the habit of doing that, and that they go to the workhouse where they will receive the best treatment. My opinion of the class that go to the workhouse is that they are an extremely poor class, that a great proportion of them are mentally and physically incapable of earning their own living, and I can give you one example to show you how poor they are. The fare of a workhouse is, in the morning, 6 oz. of bread and a pint of gruel, and in the evening the same, or 8 oz. of bread-and-water. If you substitute gruel for the additional 2 oz. of bread, you immediately increase the number of persons in a particular workhouse, showing what an inducement a little warm food is to people to go into a workhouse. And if you look at the discipline of a casual ward now, no one could possibly believe that any man would go in there unless he was really destitute.

550. Lord Thring.] You told us that an attempt had been made to supplement the Poor Law by charity at Oxford, and that it was very much opposed; upon what ground do you imagine the attempt was opposed?

I should be very glad if you would have one of the Oxford witnesses before you; but the ground upon which Mr. Hall was opposed to it was, that there was not a sufficient amount of out-door relief given to the people in Oxford, and that he thought that they were too hard upon certain classes of persons, offering the workhouse too freely.

551. But I do not understand you, yourself, to express disapprobation of the attempt to supplement the Poor Law by charity?

Mr. Hall thought that the charitable persons did work which ought to be done by the guardians themselves; I most strongly approve of it: I think the University were to be highly commended for what they did.

552. Could you suggest any particular mode in which you think it might be done most advantageously?

It only can be done, I think, where you can find a body of persons with time and means at their disposal, and who have the inclination to take up such very hard work. There are very few places where you would find that, but I think my colleague, Mr. Davy, will give you some evidence about that with regard to Germany.

553. Chairman.] Do you know what was the reason why it was thought that the guardians, rather than other people, ought to relieve those persons at Oxford?

There were certain cases brought out which they thought ought to have been dealt with by the guardians, and not by the Charity Society. They thought that these persons might fall between two stools, in fact. It has not been the case; but I would rather not enter into the controversy.

554. My difficulty is in understanding upon what ground any persons should object to the poor being relieved by charity rather than out of the rates:

I think that the ground that would be taken would be this: that if you have an admirable society working to take up all persons who ought not to be receiving Poor Law relief, you would then enable the Poor Law guardians to administer relief more firmly and more strictly than they would if they did not know that the law was really tempered by charity organisation.

(70.)
555. Then I understand you to say that there are persons who will argue that it is a bad thing to discourage by means of charitable organisation the granting of relief out of the rates, and that relief out of the rates is therefore more beneficial to the poor than relief given as charity?—It would appear so; but I think the argument of those who wish to give more out-door relief would be that they have no power to compel charity organisation to do any particular thing, and that they would be perhaps depriving the destitute of a legal right to relief.

556. Earl of Micletown.] What I understood you to say that the Member for Oxford objected to was, that there was not sufficient out-door relief now given, and that he objected to the too strict terms under which it was given?

That was the commencement of the controversy.

557. Earl Spencer.] Were they able to show that improvidence was encouraged by too great private relief being given, because that might be one of their objections, I presume?

No, I think not; it was entirely a question as to whether the guardians were not handing over to some one else cases which they ought to have taken up themselves.

558. With regard to the vagrants, or what you call the casual poor, in a district, where do they generally come from?

They have generally black coats on, which makes me think that they come from towns, as a rule; but you cannot believe a word they say as to where they come from, because they have reasons for never telling you the truth. If you ask a man at Oxford where he has come from, and if he says that he has come from Bath, he has probably come round by Northampton and Bletchley and somewhere else to get to Oxford. You can never believe what they say. But the great bulk of them, I should say, are poor people from towns.

559. Not agricultural labourers?

Certainly not. I have constant complaints from living in the country of the inundation of people from the towns walking about the country.

560. There are certain times of the year, are there not, when the rural unions are full of these people?

Yes; at the time of the hop-picking in Kent the casual wards are filled with hop-pickers. But I think that it is almost an insult to most of the agricultural labourers to suggest to them that, when they are going "up the country," as they call it near London in search of work, they get lodgings at the public expense in the vagrant wards of a workhouse. I believe the great bulk of them would scorn the idea.

561. In the midland counties are there not certain periods of the year when the vagrant population seem to be concentrated in the large towns, and passing through and using the workhouses?

Yes, at particular times they come. For instance, before the Derby there is a perfect influx of persons going in that direction, but they never occupy the Epsom Workhouse on the Tuesday night before the Derby; and it is the same at Windsor, the night before the cup day at Ascot.

562. Earl of Onslow.] You know the agricultural districts well; within your own experience are there a large number of agricultural labourers leaving the villages; is there any depopulation of the villages?

The Registrar General's Report points out very clearly that dwellers in towns are increasing very largely as compared with dwellers in the country; but if one looks at the returns of the population, they do not show that there is any material decrease of the labourers in the country districts. This we all know; that the young, and the strong, and the men with heads on their shoulders, have, long before this agricultural depression, been leaving the agricultural districts for the purpose of seeking better work in towns; but I have not lately heard in any part of my district, which is a great deal of it agricultural, of any number of men leaving the agricultural districts to go into the towns.

563. Does
563. Does that apply to the occupiers of cottages?  
Certainly.

564. Are there many cottages vacant in your district from the migration of agricultural labourers?  
I hardly know that officially; but I have considerable intercourse with very large land agents, and I asked the question on Saturday of one of the largest land agents in the middle of England, and he told me that it was quite an exception to have an agricultural cottage vacant.

565. Chairman.] It is the case, is it not, that, as a rule, vagrants are a special class?  
Yes; I think there is always an army of men walking about the country who subsist by begging and in the workhouses; but the numbers we relieve in the workhouses are very small in proportion to the whole number of the actual vagrant class. They are a pretty good barometer. In times of great depression the number of those men are supplemented by the poorest and weakest of the people out of the towns.

566. But a large proportion of those vagrants are always men who prefer that life to any other, for various reasons?  
Quite so.

567. You told us, I believe, in the course of your previous examination, that you did not think that there was any considerable increase of vagrants generally; but just now you used the expression that many persons complained of an inundation of people into their neighbourhood; is that quite consistent?  
I draw a distinction between vagrants and casual poor. We have no great increase of casual poor in the workhouse; but there is a great complaint of a great number of persons walking about the country who come out of the towns. If Mr. Pell's Act is strictly enforced, a great proportion of those people will never come near the workhouse at all.

568. In your agricultural districts, do you, or do you not, observe that recently there has been any increase in the number of those vagrants who apply to the workhouse?  
There is a small increase, but nothing very large. The only place where there has been complaint is in the neighbourhood of the Ship Canal at Manchester, Warrington, and those places where they have gathered together.

569. As a matter of fact, I believe, in all parts of rural England the births exceed the deaths, and therefore there is always a surplus population to be disposed of?  
Yes.

570. Unless there is any marked change in the system of agriculture, is it not inevitable that that surplus population should drift away to the towns?  
Yes, but they have certainly drifted more in the last 20 years than they did in the 20 years before.

571. One word about the contributions which are exacted from persons who are able to support their relations. The practice would be this, would it not, that where it was thought that there were relations liable to contribute to the support of those who were applying for relief, application would be made to them; that if it was found, upon inquiry, that they could pay, a sum would be fixed, either for the whole of their maintenance or a portion of it; and that if they were unwilling to contribute, the case would be brought before a magistrate for a magistrate's order?  
Yes.

572. But it may frequently happen that although there are relatives quite capable of contributing somewhat towards the support of the family, they cannot pay the whole?  
Quite so.

(70.)
573. In those cases it is usual to require a contribution of as much as the person is able to pay, and the rest must necessarily be supplied out of the poor rates?

Yes.

574. I think that one of the questions asked you referred to this point, namely, whether it is a good system to allow the pauper to get what he can from his relative, which is assumed to be a certain sum, and to supplement that supposed sum by a certain amount; and whether it is not a better system to give the necessary amount of relief to the pauper, and to require the person who is to contribute to his relief to pay that money to the guardians direct; do you not think that the latter is the sounder system?

As I have already stated, that is the system which the paupers infinitely prefer, because they are certain of getting the money, and many boards of guardians adopt it. Other boards of guardians think they are performing their duty if they, having agreed with the relatives that they shall pay so much to the poor person, supplement that sum with enough to make it up to what they would have given if the person had no relatives.

575. Do you not think that it is a sounder system to require the money to be paid direct. The money is undoubtedly more likely to find its way into the destitute person's pocket in that way than in the other?

Undoubtedly.

576. You said that there was an immense difference, and we all know that there is a great difference in the administration of stimulants by medical officers in the case of the sick; do you not regard that as rather a serious evil?

I am afraid it is so in private practice, and I can hardly see how we can avoid it in the public practice. I think it would be impossible for a board of guardians, or for anybody else, to compel a medical man to discontinue the use of stimulants. Over and over again I have heard a medical officer tell the guardians, "I cannot be interfered with in the practice of my profession."

577. The experience that we have is that in many parts of the country stimulants have been very largely reduced, without any injury, so far as we know, to the sick; do you not think it possible, in cases where medical officers give stimulants very largely, and much in excess of what has been found to be necessary, to signify to them that if they continue that practice they must cease to be medical officers?

I should hardly like to say that.

578. Upon what ground can it be justified that a large amount of stimulants should be given by certain medical officers, which we know, as a matter of fact, are not required, because in other districts they are not found to be necessary?

It is a question of practice. A man conscientiously believes that his patient requires a certain amount of stimulant in the very weak state that he is in. He may be right or he may be wrong; it is a matter of opinion; but I should not like to interfere between a medical officer and his patient in that direction. We have done a great deal in that direction, as you will see upon the papers.

579. Lord Balfour.] All that you have said about the administration of stimulants applies of course to the people in workhouses, not to outdoor paupers, to whom stimulants are forbidden to be given altogether?

No, there is this great difference as to stimulants in the case of outdoor relief. With regard to outdoor relief it rests entirely with the guardians, upon the recommendation of the medical officer, whether they will give the stimulants or not, for the reason that they may consider the person or his friends able to supply the stimulants. But in the workhouses you have a person who is by law not permitted to have anything brought into the workhouse at all; everything that he requires has to be provided for him by the guardians; and if the medical officer writes down in his book that he thinks his patient requires brandy or beer
beer it would be a very difficult thing indeed for a board of guardians to take the responsibility upon themselves of withholding that which the doctor considers necessary for his patient.

580. Sir Hugh Owen the other day mentioned the case of Bradfield as a conspicuous instance of what can be done by careful administration of the Poor Law. Bradfield is a rural union with an area of some 62,000 or 63,000 acres, and a population in 1871 of 15,853, and in 1881 of 17,972?

Yes.

581. Was it the case that in 1871 the outdoor paupers relieved on the 1st January amounted to 999, and the indoor paupers to 259, or a total of 1,258, a proportion, as I understand, of 1 in 13 of the population?

Yes.

582. A new system of administration began at that time, and a progressive decrease has taken place down to the 1st of January 1888.

Yes.

583. At that date the number of outdoor paupers relieved was 42 and the number of indoor paupers 100, the total being 142, and the proportion to the present population 1 in 126?

That is so.

584. That has come within your own experience?

It has. That has been in my district the whole time. Bradfield is close to Reading.

585. Can you give the Committee information as to how that remarkable change was effected.

It has been effected really by the action of one man, Mr. Garland, the Chairman, backed up by the board of guardians. Before 1871, to begin with, the permanent list of paupers was reviewed every 13 weeks. It was closed in 1871; the number upon it then was 537. Then they set up a new list which was revised every four weeks. That was closed in 1876, though six names were added to it afterwards by mistake. Now no out-relief has been given for a period of longer than two weeks since 1876, or for more than one week since 1878, with two exceptions.

586. Has there been at Bradfield any cooperation between any form of private charity and public provision for the relief of the poor?

No, but it is quite clear from these figures that unless charity had come forward in the district it would have been impossible for any board of guardians to have reduced the relief in the way they have. It has had a very happy effect, because people have gone into benefit societies. The fount of charity has not been dried up. People have come forward to assist the poor, and throughout the district I hear, both from the clerks of relieving officers, and those who reside in the district, the condition of the people was never so good as it is at present. Ample relief is given to those who need it. They deal with one class in a different way almost from any other people, except in London, and that is with regard to widows. We all know that widows are the most difficult class that we have to relieve. We all commiserate them, and we are apt perhaps to do more for them than is absolutely necessary. After a short period they give no outdoor relief whatever to widows in the Bradfield Union. They lay down a rule that a woman must support herself and one child, and they offered to take any of the other children that she cannot support into the workhouse and educate them.

587. Earl Spencer.] I notice in this little book which you have just given me, that all the medical orders given during the year 1870 were on loan?

Yes, that is so.

588. Is that a good system?

I think it is a remarkably good system. The Local Government Board have told
told the guardians that they thought it would be very difficult for them under their contracts to recover the amount in the county court; but, however, they have done it, and in practice they have pretty nearly done away with medical relief there. When a person applies for medical relief, or any relief, the relieving officer endorses across the order in "red ink," "This relief is given by way of loan." Then at the next meeting of the guardians they decide whether the condition of the person is such that there is any reasonable chance of recovering the amount at some future time. If they decide that it shall go on, when the person recovers, and is able to go to work again, the relieving officer says, "Now when you can repay the guardians this expense which they have incurred on your behalf, we do not want to be hard upon you, but you must pay us 6 d. or 1 s. a week," or whatever it may be, "till the debt is exhausted." If the person does not do that they can carry him into the county court and enforce it. The practical effect has been that the people have provided medical relief for themselves instead of coming to the board of guardians.

589. **Chairman.** But can you recover by simply endorsing the order without the contract having been signed? I think it is enough if the guardians, or the relieving officer, declares at the time the relief is given that the relief is given by way of loan. In practice, they generally ask the people to sign the loan-book as evidence, but I think the declaration is sufficient.

590. **Earl Spencer.** As a matter of fact, do the guardians get repaid these loans? They do; they were repaid up to a very recent time; but latterly people have elected to provide themselves with medical assistance, rather than come to the guardians at all.

591. **Lord Balfour.** Obviously, the persons who administer the law in such a district as the Bradfield Union would have personal knowledge of all the people with whom they came in contact?

Yes.

592. And, therefore, in one sense, their task was much easier than it would be in a populous place?

Quite so.

593. But would it, in your opinion, be fair to draw the inference from that case, that with greater care, and more personal supervision on the part of those who are charged with the administration of the law, much better results might be got by following similar lines of administration even in populous places?

I think so.

594. **Earl of Aberdeen.** Is it not your opinion that there must always be cases suitable for relief by charity on the one hand, and other cases suitable for relief from the rates, on the other hand?

I think so, certainly.

595. Would not that sufficiently account for such a controversy as arose in Oxford, without our going into the details of that particular matter?

I do not understand that it is so. I think they were working upon exactly the right lines in Oxford, and I do not quite understand the reasons for the great controversy which is going on.

596. You mean that before the controversy arose the guardians were doing their duty on the whole?

I think they were.

597. **Chairman.** I suppose in this Bradfield Union the only great change that was made was that they have discontinued, practically, all out-door relief to aged persons?

No;
No: I think that the great change was the shortening of the permanent list; in fact, doing away with it, and having the cases constantly revised before them, and discontinuing out-door relief, and the relief to widows, who form a very large percentage in every union, and also diminishing the number of the sick cases.

508. Must it not be the case in any rural union, such as the Bradfield union, that there must be a very large number of aged persons who received relief under the former system? Quite so.

509. How does it enable the board of guardians to suspend giving relief to these aged persons if they have their cases before them every fortnight or every month?

They do relieve a certain number for the time, because you will find that the relief was reduced rather gradually, the numbers being 1,258, 1,049, 950, 788, 784, 636, 489, and 431. There you come to just about the time when they had worn out the old people.

600. But my question was whether the change that was made must not necessarily have been principally the discontinuance of the relief to the aged persons. I apprehend that the larger number of the persons receiving relief before the change was made must have been aged persons?

I am hardly prepared to say that. If you add the widows and the sick cases together, they constitute a very large number.

601. I meant by my question, aged and infirm persons, not cases of temporary sickness, because in cases of temporary sickness, as I see in the report, out-door relief is given where the case is urgent?

Yes.

602. Am I not correct in saying that the change that they have made has been to discontinue the giving of out-door relief to aged and infirm persons?

A certain proportion.

603. But they must have almost entirely discontinued it?

And in the case of widows.

604. You say that there can be no union in which the widows do not form a minority of the persons applying for out-door relief, where out-door relief has been generally given?

I think they are.

605. Then I come back to what I said before, that the discontinuance must have been in the case of aged and infirm persons. How is it that in that union these aged and infirm persons are now supported, so that they do not come into the workhouse?

They must be supported by their relatives or by charity. There was plenty of room for amendment. The proportion relieved was formerly 1 in 13 of the population, and the in-door relief has decreased very largely since the alteration.

606. Do you know whether there has been any dissatisfaction amongst the working population in this union in consequence of the change of system?

I have not heard it; and it has been carried on for a great many years now, and I think we should have found a very great change among the boards of guardians if such a system did not find favour. I do not mean to say that I have not heard persons say that the guardians are too hard upon the poor.

607. But you have not heard the dissatisfaction amongst the poor themselves?

No, I have not.

(70.)

608. Earl
608. Earl of Milltown.] Should you be likely to have heard it if there had been such dissatisfaction?
I cannot say that I should; I might have done so.

609. Earl of Aberdeen.] There has been a very great diminution in the number of paupers per thousand of the population during the last 10 or 15 years, has there not?
Yes.

610. Do you consider that that decrease has been brought about by the increased strictness of administration in the matter of relief, and also by the larger application of charity, rather than by any considerable diminution in actual poverty?
It is very difficult to answer that question. I am quite sure that the great diminution of relief that took place in my district in the year 1871 was caused by improved administration. Of that I am convinced, because there was a decrease at the same time in all the workhouses, and an enormous decrease in the out-door relief. All the boards of guardians then agreed to special rules, and I believe that the decrease then was mainly, if not entirely, owing, not to the better condition of the people, but to improved administration.

611. Chairman.] To a certain extent that very salutary change was facilitated, was it not, by the fact that until within a few years the condition of the labouring population was improving, and the wages were higher?
Yes; I do not think that the condition of the labouring population was ever so good, where they are employed, as it is at this moment.

612. Has there been any remarkable fall in the last two or three years in the agricultural wages of the district to which you are referring?
There has been a reduction in the ordinary day-work labour; that is to say, the men who are paid by the week. I should say that the farmers have reduced them about 1 s. a week; but piece-work has not been reduced in price at all, that I have heard of.

613. Earl of Aberdeen.] You allude to the wages being now as good as, or better than they were some years ago; but is it not the case that there are more unemployed persons at present?
Certainly, there are more unemployed persons at present. When I spoke of wages not being reduced generally, I spoke of the northern districts in Lancashire. Although the millowners say that they have not made a profit the mills have been working, and the people have been employed. With regard to the agricultural districts there certainly have been during this winter a great number of persons out of work.

614. Lord Thring.] I am told that the independence of character of the labourer has increased lately; in other words, that he is less willing to accept poor relief; can you state generally whether your experience confirms that opinion?
I do not think they are so ready to accept relief now.

615. Earl of Hopetown.] I have heard that in boards of guardians in England the elected members as a rule are not so strict against out-door relief, and are more in favour of giving out-door relief, and that the ex officio guardians are those who are most in favour of the in-door system; is that so?
I think you may take it that the more educated a guardian becomes, either by attending the board of guardians, or by reading, or otherwise, the more convinced he soon becomes that the less out relief you give the better; and therefore probably the ex officio guardians, or some of them at any rate who study the question, would be more in favour of in-door relief than the others; but I am sorry to say that in many places very few ex officio guardians attend at all.

616. Chairman.]
616. **Chairman.** As a rule the elected guardians are such a large majority, are they not, that we must suppose that this better administration of the law is due largely to a stronger sense amongst the elected guardians themselves of the prudence of not giving out-door relief?

That is so. In the towns they manage the relief entirely. It is a lamentable thing that so few *ex officio* guardians attend the meetings of the country boards.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

*Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next,*

*at Twelve o'clock.*
Die Jovis, 26° Aprilis, 1888.
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THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, K.G., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. ROBERT HEDLEY having been called in, is Examined, as follows:

617. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You have been a General Inspector of the Local Government Board for over 20 years, and for 14 of those years in the metropolitan district?
I have.

618. The district comprises the 30 unions in the Metropolitan Board of Works area?
Yes.

619. And the three extra-metropolitan unions, as they are called, of West Ham, Croydon, and Richmond?
Yes.

620. The population of that district is now close upon 4,500,000?
Including the extra-metropolitan unions, it is.

621. In fact, that is the population of your district?
Yes, it is.

622. And the relief is administered under what we know as the Out-relief Regulation Order?
It is, in all the metropolitan unions; but two of the extra-metropolitan unions are under the Prohibitory Order. West Ham and Croydon are under the Prohibitory Order.

623. Have you any remarks to make upon that system?
I have no remarks to make, except that I think it is more an accident than anything else that those two unions, West Ham and Croydon, should be under the Prohibitory Order. I apprehend that the Prohibitory Order was issued to them at a time when they were comparatively rural unions; but during the last 20 years the population of West Ham has increased in a most extraordinary degree.

624. Do you think that those two unions should be put under the same condition as the others?
Under the same as the metropolitan unions.

625. How are the guardians elected in your district?
Most of them are elected annually; but there are two or three unions St. George's in the East for one, St. Giles for another, which have applied to the
Local Government Board to authorise the election triennially. That necessitates a poll of the ratepayers of the union.

626. Can you say which system commends itself to you? 
I highly approve of the triennial system.

627. And are there any guardians nominated by the Local Government Board?
The Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, gave power to the Local Government Board in certain unions where there were but few resident justices, and therefore few ex officio guardians to nominate a certain number if they thought fit.

628. And is that done? 
It is done in a few unions, but it is not extensively done.

629. Could you describe your duties in regard to the examination of the methods of giving relief in your district; how far do you come in contact with those who are members of the boards of guardians?
I come in contact with boards of guardians when I attend their meetings. It is my duty from time to time to attend meetings of the boards of guardians, and I am then present whilst relief is administered.

630. Will you describe to the Committee the ordinary process in your district by which, after the application to the relieving officers, cases come before the boards of guardians? 
It varies in different unions. In the majority of the metropolitan unions the relief cases are dealt with by committees; in some of them the relief cases are heard by the whole board. The application and report book, and the relief order book, are then before the guardians; the columns of the application and report book are made up by the relieving officer from the information which he has been able to obtain as regards the case, and the guardians then decide each case on its merits.

631. In most cases in which applications are adjudicated upon by the committees, are there appeals to the board of guardians as a whole?
There are.

632. Does that often happen?
Not very often, but where the cases are being dealt with by committees, and they come across a difficult case, they often then refer the case to the whole board.

633. The whole board issues standing orders for the guidance of its committees, does it not?
No, I cannot say that that is so. They give the relief under the conditions prescribed by the orders of the Local Government Board.

634. Are the committees composed of the same individuals from day to day, or do they vary from day to day?
It varies; in some unions the committees are permanent; and in others, in the West Ham Union, for instance, the committees are appointed weekly at each meeting of the board.

635. In unions where that is the case, such as West Ham, are any measures taken to secure uniformity of action, action upon definite principles?
I think not.

636. Would you consider it desirable that a safeguard should be taken in that direction?
It is not desirable, in my opinion, further to restrict the powers of guardians by orders.

637. But I meant by standing orders issued by the boards of guardians themselves for the guidance of their own committees?
It is very difficult to do that; some unions, I think, have them. I cannot say that I am individually acquainted with the orders of each board of guardians.
guardians. There are three unions in London which act very stringently under regulations, and give no outdoor relief at all.

638. Do I understand you to have any doubt either as to the desirability or as to the practicability of the committees of some boards of guardians administering relief upon something like defined principles week after week?

Defined principles would, I apprehend, mean further restrictions of the powers of guardians in giving outdoor relief.

639. I do not mean further restrictions issued from the central authority, but what I called, a moment ago, standing orders framed by the board of guardians, as a whole, for the guidance of their own committees as they sit from week to week:

I think it is a good thing where it can be done, where guardians think proper to do it.

640. Chairman. Is there any reason whatever why it should not always be done?

No, except that there are orders of the Local Government Board which guide the guardians in their action.

641. But still, under those orders there is a considerable latitude, as you are aware?

Entire latitude.

642. And in entrusting the relief to committees, would it not be very desirable that the board of guardians should lay down some rules as to how they should administer the relief under the orders, leaving it of course to the committees to refer to the board special cases which they thought exceptional?

I see no objection to that.

643. Lord Balfour of Burlei. Can you give us any information as to the classification of the indoor poor in your district?

The indoor poor in the metropolis are classed rather by workhouses than in workhouses; that is to say, that the several classes of poor are in different establishments. The old and infirm and the healthy adults are in the workhouses proper; the sick are either in infirmaries or in sick asylums; the children are in district or separate schools; all the Roman Catholic children are in certificated schools; the imbeciles are in asylums maintained by the Metropolitan Asylums Board; and infectious disease cases are dealt with in the hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

644. Do I understand you to say that the old and infirm are in the same institution as the able-bodied?

They are.

645. But surely they are classed in those institutions?

As far as possible there is special provision made for the able-bodied, but the able-bodied males in the metropolitan workhouses are an exceedingly small number. There are a considerable number of able-bodied females, but there are very few really able-bodied men in any metropolitan workhouse, with one exception, and that is the Mitcham Workhouse of the Holborn Union, which, during this winter and last winter, has had a larger number of able-bodied men in it than I ever before saw in any workhouse.

646. Could you give any reason for that?

I think it may be accounted for to some extent in this way: first, that the guardians have no labour yard, and will not have one; secondly, that there are in the Holborn Union some so-called charities, such as the Banner-street Refuge, where, as I am informed (I have no certain knowledge of it, but it is so from the general information which I have), they admit a large number of men free for several nights, and at the expiration of those five or six nights (I believe it is) they discharge these men, and they are then destitute, as destitute as they were before, and they go to the Holborn relieving officer.

(70.)
647. The Banner-street Refuge is under private management, is it not? I believe it is.

648. And is intended to be a sort of relief to the casual wards? Intended to be a refuge for the same class of persons as go to our casual wards.

649. And from the fact of its taking in so many (I believe it is capable of taking 600), and being situated in the Holborn Union, it casts an undue burden upon the Holborn guardians? I think it does.

650. When was the Banner-street Refuge opened? I should wish to say that I have no direct knowledge of it; I only know of Banner-street Refuge from hearsay; I only know what the relieving officers and officials of the Holborn guardians have given to me as a reason why they are called upon to relieve a number of able-bodied men who do not strictly belong to, and have no residence in, the Holborn Union.

651. Would that have operated more in the last two years than previously? I do not know that it would; but the Holborn guardians have always had, ever since I have known them, a great number of able-bodied men in the winter; more than other unions.

652. And can you account for that? I account for it to some extent in this way, that the workhouse in which they were, until two years ago, maintained, was not a satisfactory one, and was one in which there was no strict means of applying the labour test.

653. It is, then, rather on account of peculiarities in the administration than any peculiarities in the district, that you think there is undue pressure upon the Holborn Union? Partly peculiarities in the district, and partly peculiarities in the administration. It is a central part of Old London, about the poorest part of London, I should think, in which casuals, and vagrants, and common lodgers are very much congregated.

654. What were the special features of the workhouse administration of which you seem to disapprove? The Gray's Inn Workhouse, which was the workhouse to which I was alluding, was the workhouse in which the able-bodied men of the Holborn Union were accommodated; it stood on a very narrow area of ground, and there was no means of keeping the able-bodied men strictly to work.

655. In addition to the classification of poor which you mentioned, there are vagrants who are relieved in the casual wards? Yes, there are.

656. Have you any recommendation to make in regard to their administration? As far as my own personal views are concerned, I should very much like to see vagrants abolished altogether as a separate class of poor.

657. Would that be possible? I think it would be very simple. My solution of the difficulty would be to, as I say, abolish the distinction, and to make it a condition of the acceptance of all in-door relief that a person should not be entitled to discharge himself under a week.

658. Even on the first occasion? Even on the first occasion. To a person who comes and says that he is destitute, and wants relief from the rates, I would simply say what a lodging-house keeper would say to me if I went to Brighton and asked him to let me his lodgings for less than a week; he would say, "No, we do not let them under a week."

659. While, perhaps, desirable in the case of those who are vagrants by profession, if I might call them so, might not such a regulation as that unduly hamper
hamper the working men bonâ fide going from place to place in search of work?

I am speaking of the metropolis. I understand that the questions have reference to the metropolis.

660. Chairman.] Do you confine your recommendation to the metropolis, or large populous places?

No, I see no hardship in making that a condition of all relief.

661. To vagrants, you mean?

No, I would like to make it a condition of the acceptance of relief in the case of all classes of the poor, that they should not be entitled to take their discharge sooner. I do not want to deprive the guardians of the power of discharging a man in less than a week, but I say that he should not be entitled to claim his discharge in less than a week; it should be a condition of relief. As regards wanderers and wayfarers (which I believe to be the proper definition of a vagrant), I do not think that the class of poor who are vagrant in the metropolis can be called wayfarers at all. They go from one vagrant ward to another; they pick up what relief they can in the day, and if they are not successful in begging they come to a vagrant ward, but I do not think any of them hardly can be called able-bodied honest wayfarers in search of work. The guardians of the metropolis and the Holborn Union, to a very large extent, are very much troubled with men who come in, and are constantly going in and out, constantly discharging themselves. They come in, 50, 60, 70, and 80 a day; they will leave the workhouse after due notice; they will go, many of them, that very day, straight to the relieving officer, and will ask for an order of re-admission; many of them will come back on the same night. That gives a vast amount of trouble. They have to be bathed, they have to be inspected by the medical officer, they have to be re-clothed, their own clothes have to be taken into store; and I think it is an abuse of Poor Law relief altogether. If men of that class knew that they could not get out under a week, I think it would check the practice very much.

662. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Admitting that an immense majority of those of whom you are now speaking are what you describe, would it not, in the event of there being those bonâ fide in search of work amongst them, be a great hardship to insist on a week’s detention on the first application?

I would give full liberty to the guardians to discharge any whom they thought fit to discharge; my recommendation would be that the pauper should not be entitled to claim his discharge sooner.

663. Chairman.] But if the discretionary power was vested in the guardians, would it not practically become necessary to vest it in the masters of the workhouses?

I would allow the guardians to vest it in the masters of the workhouses.

664. The guardians do not meet, at all events oftener than once a week, as a rule, and of course a considerable period might elapse before their first meeting; then assuming that it would be necessary to leave the discretion in the hands of the master of the workhouse, do you think that would be safe?

I do.

665. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You mentioned that in some unions there was more outdoor relief given than in other unions in your district; the three unions to which you referred as giving the least, or almost no, outdoor relief, are which?

St. George’s-in-the-East, Stepney, and Whitechapel, three of the poorest unions in the metropolis, or as poor as any.

666. To what do you attribute the undoubted increase of the indoor poor which has become visible in recent years in the metropolis?

I attribute it first to increase of population.

667. You mean the gross numbers are larger on account of the increase of population?

That
That is one reason: wherever population increases there will always be a certain percentage of that increase that will be paupers, I am afraid.

668. But the point is that there has been an increase in the ratio to the population of the indoor paupers in recent years?

The ratio of pauperism to population at the present time is very much lower than it was some years ago.

669. Chairman.] But Lord Balfour's question refers to the increase of ratio of indoor to outdoor paupers: we want to know the cause of that?

I attribute it to the fact that very excellent accommodation has been provided for the indoor poor in the shape of infirmaries, hospitals of all kinds, schools, and so on.

670. Lord Balfour of Burley.] The reluctance to go into the infirmaries is not now so great as it used to be to go into the workhouses?

I believe that a great many people readily accept relief in the infirmaries who would not accept it in the workhouses.

671. Could you go further and say, within your own knowledge, that persons accept this medical relief in the infirmary who ought not to do so, on account of their not being in absolutely necessitous circumstances?

No, I cannot say that of my own knowledge. Of course guardians are supposed to satisfy themselves of the destitution of all persons who receive relief, and all guardians in London have very much reduced the freedom with which they give outdoor relief.

672. Would you like to see the system you mentioned as in operation in these three unions further extended:

For myself, I should like to see outdoor relief abolished as far as possible. I think that it operates most injuriously on the thrift and general providence of the labouring classes. I think that all relief ought only to be given to the destitute, and ought, when given, to be adequate. I believe that outdoor relief, as at present given, is always inadequate to meet real destitution, and is always given in aid of other and unknown resources. I think, also, that outdoor relief has a very baneful effect upon charity; I think that it stifles charity, if people are able to say, "Oh, everybody can go to the parish, and they will get so and so"); I think that has a very baneful effect upon charity, as real charity would come to the front much more if it knew that legal relief was only indoor relief.

673. Your idea would be gradually to educate the public mind so as to get them to work the charity in connection with such a system of Poor Law relief as you have indicated?

Yes. I have asked a very excellent relieving officer, the relieving officer of Stepney, who has been there a great many years, a Mr. Jones, and who was there when the number of outdoor poor in Stepney could be counted by thousands, whether he considers that the action of the Stepney guardians has caused any suffering, and his answer has always been that he considers that many people have pulled themselves together and have found means of supporting themselves, and that the action of the guardians in refusing outdoor relief has been wholly beneficial on the general character of the people. That is only what he has told me.

674. It would be necessary, of course, to substitute the one system for the other, only gradually?

Quite gradually: I should be very sorry to see it done by a stroke of the pen.

675. Earl of Milltown.] Is outdoor relief abolished in Stepney?

It is practically abolished in Stepney. In the third week of March 1888 the Stepney Union had only 27 outdoor paupers.

676. Chairman.] How many paupers altogether had they?

In the third week of March the Stepney Union had 1,062 indoor poor.

677. And
677. And what is the population?

The population of Stepney is about 58,000. There must always be a case or two of persons who require relief out of the workhouse on account of sickness so severe that they are unable to be removed.

678. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Into how many relieving officers’ districts is the metropolis divided?

One hundred and forty, or perhaps 141; there have been one or two changes; changes are very often occurring.

679. Is it their duty to take cognisance of all applications that are made to them?

It is as much as their place is worth not to do so.

680. Should you say that there is at the present time, on account of the want of knowledge or want of organisation, any appreciable danger of any one destitute dying of starvation from not knowing where to apply? I should think that everybody, almost everybody resident in a union, must have, either of himself or through somebody known to him, knowledge of where the relieving officer is to be found; and, in the absence of the relieving officer, there is always the overseer of each parish.

681. In practice such a case of starvation has not occurred in your knowledge?

Not of cases who have applied. It is no part of the business of the Poor Law to go and inquire whether people want relief; the Poor Law does not go round; it is no part of the relieving officer's business to go in search of destitution, unless he is applied to.

682. Have any cases of death in the metropolis from starvation been reported to you, or through you, in recent years?

There have been one or two cases this winter where persons in receipt of out-door relief were found by a coroner's jury to have died of starvation; one occurred in Lambeth, an old couple there.

683. They were at the time in receipt of out-door relief? They were at the time in receipt of 3 s. 6 d. per week out-door relief.

684. Do you know the circumstances; whether they had been offered the poor-house or whether they had complained of inadequate relief? They had had that relief for a long time, and they had shown unwillingness to come into the workhouse. The 3 s. 6 d. a week had been allowed to them by the guardians for some time. The woman was found dead, and the husband was removed to the infirmary and died very soon after. They were in receipt at the time of 3 s. 6 d. a week.

685. How many of the metropolitan unions have labour yards?

At the present time about a third of them have labour yards; there are two or three which are in possession of labour yards, but have not opened them; there are about a third which have labour yards in operation.

686: Have you anything to say with regard to the administration of the labour yard?

The labour yard ought, in my opinion, only to be used as a last resource, when every effort to accommodate applicants for relief in the workhouse has failed, and when there is no possible means of accommodating them in the workhouse. The labour yard, of course, is never a real test of work; it is merely a test to prove that the men are not at the time in work elsewhere; but the labour which is required from them is never very severe; in most of the yards there is a nominal task, but it is never enforced with any strictness; there is no means of enforcing a task of work except by taking the pauper before the magistrates, and that is resorted to as little as possible; provided a person employed in the labour yard shows general willingness to do his work, the full task is rarely enforced.

(70.) L 4 687. He
687. He works hard when the master is looking at him, but otherwise he is idle, I suppose.

I am afraid there is a great deal of that.

688. In the nature of things that is almost incurable, is it not; it is impossible to find a remedy for that effect of labour yards, as a labour test?

It is a test of destitution; because the person would not come there for the small payment that is made if he could find work elsewhere.

689. But the difficulty of enforcing full work in a labour yard is so great as practically to make it not a very useful test as between the idle and the industrious?

No, I think not.

690. The naturally idle has full scope for his inclinations in a labour yard?

I think he has.

691. Have you any remark to make upon the fact that although the total pauperism of the metropolis at the present time shows an increase of about 7,000 over this time last year, the pauperism of the East end unions shows for the same time an absolute decrease, and that none of them have a labour yard at the present time?

That is the fact. The pauperism of the metropolis at the present time shows an increase of about 7,000 over this time last year; but the pauperism of the seven East-end unions shows an absolute equality of figures according to the last Returns published by the Local Government Board.

692. It is the fact, is it not, that none of those seven unions has had a labour yard this winter?

It is a fact.

693. I do not want to press it too far, perhaps it is not fair to generalise from one instance, but do you wish to imply that that cause is effect?

I believe that a great many men are relieved in labour yards who would not accept indoor relief if it were offered to them, and who would find means of supporting themselves.

694. But, being offered relief in a labour yard, they are less anxious to find independent work for themselves than they would be if that were not the case?

I believe so.

695. Do you wish to say anything about the policy of the emigration of children which has been attempted, more or less, recently?

A certain number of children have been sent to Canada, and the Local Government Board have issued regulations. It is certainly a very cheap way for guardians to dispose of children. A pauper child will cost a board of guardians, say something like 20 l. a year to maintain; his emigration to Canada will cost perhaps 10 l.; therefore, in six months a child is got rid of who might otherwise have been chargeable to the union for several years.

696. Yes; but not looking at it as a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence, have you anything to say as to its being an expedient thing in the interest of the children themselves?

Of course, I have never been to Canada, and have never myself had ocular demonstration of the results arrived at by the children out there; but from what I have heard, and from a report which was made by a colleague of mine some 10 years ago, a Mr. Doyle, who went to Canada for the special purpose of seeing those children, I have always entertained the opinion that it should be done with great care. I know that the Roman Catholic authorities, who are very keen in emigrating big boys, will not send out girls; they do not emigrate any girls; they merely emigrate big boys who are capable of working when they get out there. I think that girls ought only to be sent out at a very early age, so that they may have time to grow up and to be recognised as members of the families in which they are placed, and not as servants and drudges.

697. Is
607. Is there any other point on which you wish to speak?
I do not think there is, unless I may add this. The emigration of adults is sometimes mentioned. I believe that very few of the metropolitan paupers are in any way eligible or fit subjects for emigration. As I have already said, there are very few metropolitan paupers who are able-bodied enough to make good emigrants.

608. Earl of Aberdeen.] In recommending the abolition of vagrants as a separate class of paupers, were you referring to London or to the country generally?
The country generally.

609. Would you be in favour of classification of paupers to a greater extent than is adopted at present with reference to the difference between the habitual resorters to the workhouse, and those who are only driven there by stress of circumstances?
I think that it is highly desirable, as far as possible, to classify the inmates of workhouses; but that becomes very difficult in consequence of the large amount of different buildings and different officers which each class requires to superintend them; therefore it adds very largely to the expense.

700. As regards casual wards, do you find that there is any difficulty with regard to classification there; I mean owing to the very different classes of people who apply for admission?
The majority of the metropolitan vagrant wards are what are called cellular wards, or separate berth wards, and therefore each individual is classed separately by himself.

701. As to the detention, if a man applies to a casual ward who has not been there before, and states that he merely wants a night's refuge, is it customary to dispense with the power of detention in such a case?
It is competent to the guardians to do so.

702. It is left to the discretion of the superintendent?
It is left to the discretion of the superintendent.

703. Is it frequently, so far as you know, the custom to dispense with the power of detention?
It is, very frequently. At the present time several of the metropolitan casual wards, in consequence of the pressure which arose upon the more central wards of the metropolis last autumn, are not detaining casuals at all; they are discharging them on the following morning.

704. At 9 o'clock in the morning?
At 11.

705. Why do they keep them till 11 o'clock?
In order that they may do a small task of work.

706. Is there not a task of work that they can do in the evening?
They come in at a late hour generally.

707. But are they let out as soon as they have done their work, or at a fixed hour?
They are generally let out at a fixed hour; if they had not done their work they would be kept till they have done it.

708. Earl of Onslow.] Are they not obliged to be in the workhouse the whole day?
Under the Act of 1882, commonly known as Mr. Pell's Act, a vagrant admitted on one evening is detained the whole of the next day to perform his task of work, and is then discharged at an early hour on the following morning, having slept there two nights.

709. Earl of Aberdeen.] But I understand you to say if he is only in for one night, the detention is not kept up till the following day, but he is let out at 11 o'clock?
(70.)

M

Yes,
Yes, or sometimes they let them go earlier; if the man will give any reasonable reason why he should be let go earlier, he is allowed to go.

710. Earl of Strafford.] Do you approve of the principle of boarding out pauper children?

I think that it is a system which is applicable to a certain number of children. I do not think that it can ever be made to take the place of district and Poor Law schools; I approve of it up to a certain point. I think there are great objections to it. I think the principal objection that I have to it is that the sum which is allowed for a boarded-out child is 4s. a week under the orders of the Local Government Board, besides an amount for clothing and a certain amount for medical attendance. Now I think that there are very few labourers with families in the country who can afford to spend 4s. a week on each of their children, and therefore I think that it is calculated to induce the labourer to point to the pauper as being better off than himself.

711. Do you know what numbers there are of boarded-out children within the metropolitan area?

Between 600 and 700 at the present time.

712. And is the supervision and inspection conducted in a manner which you think is satisfactory?

I have no knowledge. Once they leave the district they go to the boarding committees, which are situate in different parts of England; some of the children of the metropolis will even go to Westmoreland. I have nothing to do with them.

713. That does not at all come under your cognisance?

Not at all.

714. Putting aside the financial difficulty which you explained to us, do you see any other objection to pauper children being boarded out; do you not think that the home-care which they enjoy in the cottages in Surrey and Essex and other parts within the metropolitan radius, so to say, is rather better than the care and attention they would receive in the workhouse schools?

Where it is done with great care I am quite sure that it is often very beneficial. But I cannot but think, myself, that where you find that an agricultural labourer with two or three children of his own, is willing to take in a pauper child at 4s. a week in addition to his own family, he does so because of the addition to his income which it makes, and he takes it in for the sake of the money which he gets from it; and that being so, I am afraid that, unless done with great care, cases will arise where the children will be found not to be as well cared for as they might be. I was once sent down some 15 years ago by the Local Government Board to inspect and report upon all the boarded-out children in Westmoreland and Cumberland, the Boarding out Committee being then one of the first established. Miss Pearsner was the chief lady connected with the committee. Nothing could have been more perfect and satisfactory than the condition in which I found all the children. But then that is rather an exceptional district; there are a good many small farmers and small freeholders there. That is the only personal experience I have of children boarded out.

715. There is a lady Inspector, Miss Mason, who inspects children boarded out?

Yes.

716. And does she make a report to you or to the Local Government Board?

Not to me, but to the Local Government Board direct.

717. And her report is appended to the annual report of the Board?

Yes.

718. She has been in the position about three years, has she not?

I do not think more than two.

719. She is the only lady Inspector?

Yes.

720. Does she perform the duties which the late Mrs. Nassau Senior performed? Mrs. Nassau Senior performed similar duties some years ago to those now performed by Miss Mason, did she not?

Mrs.
Mrs. Nassau Senior, visited and reported upon the District Poor Law Schools.

721. Not upon the condition of the children boarded out?
I do not think she ever reported upon them.

722. Are Miss Mason's duties confined to the reporting on the boarded-out children, or do they extend to the schools?
They are confined to the boarded-out children.

723. Earl of Milford. Has she to report upon the condition of all the boarded-out children in England?
I am only imperfectly acquainted with the instructions which Miss Mason has received; I know she has reported for a good many.

724. About how many boarded-out children are there in England and Wales?
I should say between 600 and 700 metropolitan children; I am afraid I can hardly say how many there are generally.

725. I understand from you that in your judgment it is very doubtful whether any proper supervision can be exercised over these children, and the manner in which they are treated in the homes?
I do not think I went as far as that; I think I said that I cannot help thinking that they must be taken in because of the value of the 4 s.

726. No doubt they are not taken in from purely philanthropic motives; what I wanted to know was whether you were of opinion that the supervision which is now exercised over them is of necessity insufficient to see whether they are carefully looked after?
My personal opinion (I am only giving my personal opinion now) is, that when children are boarded out under the care of a boarding-out committee which has been recognised and approved by the Local Government Board, the children should be left wholly to the care of that committee. The Boarding-out Order of the Local Government Board requires that the committee should report periodically to the guardians, and that the schoolmaster of the school which the child attends should report periodically; and the great object of the boarding-out system being, as I understand it, to dissociate children from pauperism, I think they should be as little inspected as possible by Poor Law officials.

727. Then do you suggest any other means by which they should be inspected?
My view is that they should be left to the responsibility of the boarding-out committee.

728. You do not mean to say, I suppose, that 4 s. a week is too much to allow for their maintenance?
No, I do not.

729. Going to another point, do I understand you to say that the Local Government Board have the power, should they think fit, to alter the annual election of guardians to triennial elections?
They have the power, subject to the approval of the ratepayers.

730. Under what Act is that?
It is under the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, I think.

731. How is the opinion of the ratepayers taken?
A poll is taken.

732. Has that ever been done?
Yes, several times.

733. In the metropolis?
Yes, certainly.

(70.)
734. Are there some unions in the metropolis where the election takes place triennially?
There are.

735. Can you tell me where?
St. Giles and St. George's, Bloomsbury, is one.

736. Is the Act giving that power to the Local Government Board confined to the metropolis?
No.

737. It is applicable all over England?
Yes.

738. And in your judgment that is a preferable system to the annual election?
In my judgment it is extremely desirable that guardians should be elected triennially instead of annually.

739. Lord Thring.] By triennially do you mean all going out at the end of three years?
Yes, I do. The reason why I think that desirable is, that at the present time, when a new board is formed, it takes a little time for them to get together to feel their feet, as I may say; and then again, for a month or two before their year expires it is a very common thing to hear, "Well, you know we are a dying body; you must wait." Supposing I, as an inspector, were to go there and suggest anything to be done, you would hear, "Oh, well, better wait until the new board comes in;" that sort of thing.

740. Chairman.] But is not that rather more applicable to triennial elections, because, in point of fact, at the end of the third year there would naturally be a feeling that it was a dying body; whereas, if it were a yearly election, that feeling would scarcely exist?
I think it does.

741. Do you not think there would be a tendency to change the board more largely after the end of three years than one year?
My experience is that where men devote themselves to the work of the guardians, there is, as a rule, a very little change in the names of the gentlemen who are returned year by year.

742. Earl of Milltown.] You say that there is a very large increase in the number of able-bodied men in the Mitcham Workhouse of the Holborn Union?
Yes.

743. How many are there there now?
There have been in the course of this winter as many as 1,200 inmates in that workhouse; not all able-bodied men, but the majority of them being able-bodied men.

744. It is able-bodied men my question refers to; because I understand you to say that, as a rule, in the metropolis there are no able-bodied men in the workhouses?
There are not

745. With the exception you have just mentioned, I want to know how many there are as a rule?
There have been during the course of this winter very near 1,000: from 800 to 1,000. I cannot say nearer than that.

746. Do they remain there long?
A great many of them have now left.

747. What class of men are they?
Very few of them were men whom a recruiting serjeant would have looked at, or whom a railway contractor would have looked at. They were men classed as able-bodied, but a vast number of them would not have stood the test of strict medical
medical examination; many of them were classed as able-bodied, because they were young.

748. I want to ascertain whether they were bona fide working men, or whether they were those who go under the name of tramps.
A good many of them had come from different parts of England; a great many of them were strangers to the metropolis; a good many of them were militia men.

749. Were they in search of work?
I think some of them would have worked if they could.

750. The militia, as I understand, were country militia?
No, not the country militia. Last winter, not this winter, but the winter before, there were a good many London militia in the Mitcham Workhouse of the Holborn Union.

751. I understood you to say that it is not the duty of the relieving officer to look for distress?
No.

752. Does that mean that if he hears of a case of distress he is not to go and look after it?
I do not think it means that; it does not go so far as that. If he is told that there is a case of distress he would go and look after it.

753. He is not bound to wait until the person in distress makes the application, is he?
Not till the individual in distress has made an application. I think it would certainly be the duty of a relieving officer to make inquiries, if he was informed that there was within his district a case of destitution.

754. That is what I meant. Now, with regard to these two poor people who appear to have died of starvation, I understand you to say that they had an allowance of 3 s. 6 d. a week outdoor relief?
They had.

755. Had they any rent to pay?
They had rent to pay.

756. Probably it would be at least 2 s. 6 d.?
It would.

757. And, therefore, the whole allowance for these two poor old people to live upon was 1 s. a week?
Yes, that would be so.

758. Perhaps under those circumstances it is not very surprising that they died of starvation?
No, it is not?

759. Chairman.] But I understood from your statement that they had been living for a considerable time upon this 3 s. 6 d.?
They had.

760. Therefore it may be presumed that they had, certainly up to the time when unfortunately they fell into a state of absolute destitution, had other means?
They had had other means, no doubt.

761. It is, therefore, an illustration of the practice of giving outdoor relief, which is not really sufficient for the relief of destitute persons, without the aid of other funds?
Certainly; 3 s. 6 d. a week would not be at all an unusual sum to allow to an old couple.

(76.)
762. In London it would certainly not be adequate?
Certainly not.

763. Earl of Milltown.] I suppose they had been offered the house?
I forget whether, in this particular case, they had been offered the house; but they had been in receipt of this allowance for two or three years, to the best of my recollection.

764. It was not the duty of anybody to go and see how they were getting on on this allowance?
It was; it was the duty of the relieving officer to go and see; and he had failed to perform his duty, and he very nearly lost his position in consequence.

765. So that there was a distinct breach of duty on that occasion, at any rate, on the part of the relieving officer?
There was. No man ever escaped more narrowly than he did the loss of his position.

766. But he has not lost it?
He has not; he had been relieving officer for more than 20 years, and there had never been any previous complaint against him.

767. Earl of Hopetown.] Referring to the emigration of children to Canada, to what part of Canada are they sent?
I believe, but I am not speaking from absolute knowledge, the Roman Catholic boys are chiefly sent to the neighbourhood of Quebec and that district, where the French colonists are; and I believe the other children, emigrated to a great extent under Miss Rye, go to the neighbourhood of Ottawa and Toronto.

768. And are the Canadian families who receive them ready to treat them as part of their families, as opposed to treating them as "drudges and servants," to use your own expression?
I am not speaking of anything that is within my knowledge; but I have a general knowledge that female domestic labour is extremely scarce in North America and Canada, and that is the principal reason why personally I object to any girl being emigrated who can possibly be turned into a domestic drudge.

769. Chairman.] What is your objection to these persons, who probably in all cases belong to the class of life where domestic service would be very suitable, entering into domestic service in Canada?
I have no objection, provided they are old enough to take care of themselves.

770. Your objection only applies to children too young to really take care of themselves?
Yes. I mentioned the report which was made by my colleague, Mr. Doyle; and there is a very good story which he tells. He says to a little girl who has been emigrated, "You have been adopted, my little girl; do you understand what adoption means?" And the little girl answered, "Please, sir, adoption is when folks gets girls to work without wages." And I have never forgotten that story.

771. Earl of Hopetown.] Then you think, on the whole, that the children who are boarded out in this country have a better time of it than the ones sent to Canada?
I will not say better, but I think as good. I believe at this moment domestic female servants are scarce, are not very easily got in London, and I do not think that there is found any difficulty in the poor law schools of the metropolis in placing the girls as they grow up into respectable service.

772. You mentioned just now that among the casual paupers there were a good number of militia men?
I said
I said there were a good many militia men in the Mitcham Workhouse. As casuals, I believe there are, too.

773. As a rule, in the workhouses is there a large percentage of discharged soldiers and reserve men? No; as I said before, there are very few able-bodied men; that is to say, men able to earn their living by the sweat of their brow, in the metropolitan workhouses. There are a great many classed as able-bodied; that is chiefly for dietetic purposes, for their food; many of the young men are cripples or have something wrong with them, but the really able-bodied men are extremely few.

774. Lord Thring.] About triennial elections; I understand you to approve of the continuity in the existence of a board of guardians so far as possible? Yes.

775. That being so, I do not understand why you wish to bring the whole of the board to an end at a particular period, instead of having a triennial, or quintennial, or any other equal rotation? At present the whole board comes to an end annually.

776. But in a great many parts of England they come to an end only by thirds; would you not prefer to either bringing them wholly to an end annually or bringing them wholly to an end at any other period, to bring them to an end by rotation, that is, a certain proportion goes out this year, and next year, and the year after, and so forth; therefore the board never goes out wholly at all. Would you or not think that a better plan than turning them out at any fixed period wholly?

I would prefer to see the whole board, as they are, re-elected as they are now, only triennially instead of annually; you avoid thereby the annual excitement and expense of election.

777. That is the reason, I understand; but that discontinues the whole board every three years? It does.

778. I ask you whether you do not prefer that, so far as possible, there should be a continuity in the board? I think that the probability is that the majority of the same guardians would be re-elected triennially, as they are now re-elected annually.

779. Then, on the whole, you prefer whether it is more or less continuous, that they should all go out in three years, and not be re-elected in any rotation whatever? I do.

780. One question with respect to the discharge of these paupers. If you vest in any body of guardians a discretion as to discharging the paupers, inexpedient or otherwise, must not that practically be exercised by the master of the workhouse?

It would, to a great extent.

781. With respect to the Banner-street Refuge, that is, in fact, a charitable vagrant ward, rather more comfortable than a workhouse vagrant ward, is it not? It is a charitable vagrant ward; I do not know whether it is comfortable or not; I believe it is not, but I have never been inside it.

782. Did I not understand you to say that that charitable ward, by reason of its comfort, attracted more vagrants to Holborn than were attracted to other places? Not by reason of its comfort, but by the fact that it admits them, and gives them a free lodging for several nights.

(70.)

783. Are
783. Are they admitted more easily there?
Yes, they are admitted freely without question, as I understand.

784. No labour:
No labour.

785. No bath:
No, nothing.

786. You said you were very much against outdoor relief; would you be of opinion that no outdoor relief should be given in places where there was no charitable organisation to supplement the Poor Law?
I think it would be difficult to abolish outdoor relief absolutely and entirely without some form of organised charity.

787. Earl Spencer.] You referred to the administration of the Poor Law in Stepney, and gave us some figures with regard to the ratio of outdoor and indoor relief to the population in 1888; could you give us any figures to compare them with for the time previous to that, before the new mode of administration was adopted?
I have not got any accurate figures with me, but I can say generally that 20 years ago Stepney had more thousands of the outdoor poor than it has now.

788. You have not any specific figures?
I have not here.

789. With regard to labour yards; you spoke of them; did you state how many labour yards there are in operation in the metropolis?
Ten or 11; 10, I think.

790. Are the labour yards entirely independent of the workhouse?
One or two of them are; the majority are not.

791. Where they are not, is it in the labour yard that the pauper who receives indoor relief does his work?
In one or two cases it is, but, as a rule, they are separate from the indoor paupers.

792. They are entirely connected with outdoor relief?
They are entirely connected with outdoor relief, but in one or two cases the the outdoor labour men work in the same yard as some of the inmates of the workhouse which is on the premises.

793. Some of the inmates of a workhouse do work in the labour yard?
I am sorry to say they do. We disapprove of it, and endeavour to prevent it as much as possible, but there are one or two instances where it does occur.

794. What are the regulations which are in force in the labour yard?
There are no specific regulations. The men, as a rule, are expected to be there from 9 o'clock to 12, when an hour is allowed for dinner, and from 1 to 4; those are the usual hours, with some variations at different periods.

795. Do they send men in the labour yard after the offer of the house has been given to them and they have refused it?
I think not. If guardians have offered the house, they will adhere to that as a rule.

796. They do not then offer the labour yard?
No.

797. Then what particular class do they offer the labour yard to?
The labour yard is in consequence of the workhouse being quite full.

798. Do they never offer the labour yard until the house is full?
Some of them do.

799. Then what distinction do they draw; that is what I want to get clear?

It
It depends upon the feeling of different boards of guardians. And then there are occasionally certain men whom they know. Now the City of London has no actual, what may be called, labour yard, but it is in the habit of sending a few men up instead of taking them into their workhouse to work at the work-house.

800. Even if the workhouse is not full?
   Even if the workhouse is not full.

801. Are there any regulations laid down by the Local Government Board with regard to labour yards?
   The task of work has to be approved by the Local Government Board, and a fixed task of work is approved.

802. But how they apply it is left entirely in the discretion of the guardians?
   Yes; the severity with which they enforce the completion of the full task is left to the discretion of the guardians.

803. But I meant the offer of it, whether they can do that if the house is full or not, and so on?
   Yes.

804. That is left entirely to their own discretion?
   Yes.

805. Are there any of the labour yards that, in your opinion, work well?
   I disapprove of labour yards, except under emergencies, where there is an absolute impossibility of otherwise relieving the persons.

806. You mean when the house is full, and when there is very great outdoor distress.
   Then in order to entitle the guardians to give men outdoor relief, it is necessary that they should also give them a task of work.

807. That is the idea of labour yards?
   That is the law.

808. But apparently, from what you say, in some unions that is rather abused, and it is mixed up with the administration of the house?
   Not the administration of the house. In some unions they have not got a separate labour yard, and they will give a few men orders for the labour yard, where they will work in the same yard with some of the inmates.

809. But that is not a system that you approve of?
   No.

810. Earl of Onslow.] I understood you to say that you attributed the increase in the proportion of indoor poor to outdoor poor in a great measure to the increased care taken of the indoor poor in the direction of medical relief?
   Yes.

811. I should like to know whether you think that the fact that the whole common fund of the metropolis has been charged with 5 d. per head of the paupers in any union, may not have tended to make the guardians apply the in-door test rather more severely?
   I am quite sure that the 5 d. a day allowed from the Metropolitan Common Poor Fund has had a great effect in reducing the outdoor pauperism, and to some extent increasing the indoor pauperism.

812. Are any exceptional steps taken by any of the metropolitan unions to make themselves en rapport with those who have the administration of charitable funds?
   The three unions I have mentioned as having almost abolished outdoor relief all work in co-operation with charity.

813. Can you tell us what the steps are that they take?
   I know that there are always present at the meetings of the guardians members of the Charity Organization Society chiefly, who will often take in hand cases that appear to be more suitable for charity than for the Poor Law.

814. Chairman.
814. Chairman.] With reference to the mode in which the boards of guardians work, can you tell us how often they revise generally their lists?

We always endeavour that relief shall be put on for as short a period as possible. In the great majority of cases, in the metropolitan unions, relief is never put on for a longer period than three months.

815. Do you mean that there are any metropolitan unions who put on relief for more than three months?

There are occasionally old chronic cases who are put on for six months.

816. I conclude that they have a periodical revision, which is customary, as far as I know, with all boards; do you know how often that revision takes place?

No; I think there are a great many that have no periodical revision; each case is revised when the time expires for which the relief has been ordered.

817. Do you mean that there are really boards that have no periodical revision of the whole of their cases?

Not of the whole of the cases in the lump. I do not myself see much the advantage of it.

818. Do not you think that it would be very desirable that all boards of guardians should be required, as a body, to revise the whole of their list once every three months?

Each case is revised once every three months. What you suggest would entail a great deal of trouble, and the office of guardian at the present time is an extremely laborious one in the metropolis. You will remember that if cases are put on for short periods, the case is revised at the expiration of the period. If the case is put on, as many of them are, for six weeks, or a month, or two months, each case is revised at the expiration of that time.

819. You told us that two of the unions under your charge as Inspector are under the Prohibitory Order?

Yes.

820. But you thought that it was desirable that that should be changed; can you tell us why?

Because the character of the union has entirely changed since the time when the order was issued to them.

821. But inasmuch as the principal difference, I believe (I may be wrong; you will correct me if I am), between the practice under the Prohibitory Order and under the order which is not prohibitory, is that under the Non-prohibitory Order you may have a labour yard, and you are not in favour of labour yards, why do you desire that these labour yards should be introduced into West Ham and Croydon?

Both West Ham and Croydon have labour yards.

822. Then under what order are they?

Because where unions are under the Prohibitory Order, and it is found that, owing to deficient workhouse accommodation, it is necessary that they should have the opportunity of giving outdoor labour tests, what is called an outdoor labour test is issued, and there are also means under the Prohibitory Order which enable guardians to report cases and to receive the approval of the Local Government Board.

823. With the view you have expressed as to the inexpediency of the labour yards, should you see any objection to the Prohibitory Order being made general, with a power, on application from the guardians to the Local Government Board, to issue a temporary relaxation, so that the labour yards might be established when the workhouses were full, or for any very special reason that might occur?

I do not think that any advantage would result from that system.

824. But if you are in favour of discontinuing the labour yards as a rule, is not that the obvious measure to resort to?
I am in favour of using the labour yards as little as possible, and only when they become absolutely necessary.

825. Then I repeat my question: would not that object which you are in favour of be best effected by applying the prohibitory order universally, and only allowing it to be relaxed in special cases?

The special cases in London unions, I think, would be so frequent that I do not see any great advantage that would result.

826. Then if that be the case, how do you maintain that the labour yards could be dispensed with, if special cases are so common?

There are certainly unions in London which in the present state of their workhouse accommodation would be unable to dispense with labour yards; therefore the change would only necessitate immediate application to the Local Government Board for relaxation.

827. Have you heard of any discontent of a serious nature among the paupers in any of the unions where out-door relief has been practically discontinued?

I have not.

828. You objected to the boarding-out system on the ground that the labourer would contrast the position of his own children with the position of the child for whom he got 4s. a week; would he not be able to perceive that in the one case he was required to make a sacrifice for his own children, while in the other case, of course, he cannot be called upon to make any sacrifice; and therefore, for that reason, he receives an amount fully covering all possible expense?

That might operate on his mind.

829. And do not you think that there is some advantage in this respect in the boarding-out system, where it is carefully looked after, over any other; that the child is placed with suitable foster-parents, in the same class of life as itself, and with the same habits as those that belong to that class?

Yes.

830. In point of fact, the success of the boarding-out system depends entirely upon the care with which it is supervised?

Yes.

831. Lord Thring.] Assuming that there were discontent on the cessation of outdoor relief, would it be likely to be brought to your knowledge or not?

The Local Government Board frequently receives letters from individuals who complain that they have not been granted outdoor relief, and the usual answer is that by statute the Local Government Board has no power to interfere in individual cases.

832. As far as you know there has been no discontent at the cessation of outdoor relief?

No, there has not been, I think. In individual cases there may have been discontent, but certainly not any general discontent at the cessation of outdoor relief. I do not at this moment remember hearing of any such letter from the East End Unions, where outdoor relief has been more or less discontinued.

833. Would you, yourself, as being an inspector, be likely to hear if the poorer people of Stepney generally or partially disapproved of the cessation of outdoor relief?

I do not think I should, personally.

834. Earl of Aberdeen.] Is it the custom in the imbecile wards in London to employ pauper nurses.

No, they have paid attendants.

835. That is a comparatively new improvement, is it not?

The imbeciles are never kept long in the workhouse; they are in the imbecile asylums
asylums of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, which are enormous establishments; Caterham contains about 2,000; Leavesden contains about 2,000.

836. Speaking generally, are pauper nurses no longer employed in the workhouses?—Speaking generally, all “sick” paupers are under the care of skilled paid nurses in the metropolis.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. JAMES STEWART DAVY having been called in; is Examined as follows:

837. Lord Balfour of Burley]. You are a Local Government Board inspector, and have been so for 16 years.

Yes.

838. During that period there have been at various times 200 different unions under your charge?

Yes; I have been employed in Wales and the manufacturing districts of Lancashire, and the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire; now I have Kent and Sussex in my district.

839. Your experience has been peculiar in this way, has it not, that during the last 15 years you have happened to be inspector in districts where strikes and lock-outs have occurred from depression of trade and from severity of weather?

That has been so, ever since the great South Wales strike in 1872-73.

840. Last year you were selected to report on the Poor Law of Germany, and the workmen’s colonies now being established there?

Yes; I spent some of the summer in Germany for that purpose.

841. The volume before me contains the report?

Yes.

842. Will you give us from your own experience some of the causes which have led to exceptional periods of distress and the necessity of relief to the able-bodied amongst the working classes.

In my experience the most common cause of exceptional distress has been strikes and lock-outs; next depression in trade in some particular locality, and then the weather occasionally from severe frost, as in 1879 and 1880.

843. The expression “unemployed” may mean those who are unemployed on account of no fault of their own, or on account of their habits being such as that no person will employ them?

That is so.

844. You propose to speak, in the first instance, of the class you have just mentioned; those who have lost their work through no fault of their own?

Yes.

845. Does it make any difference in the administration of the relief under the Poor Law, how it comes about that the applicant is reduced to making his application.

It ought to make none. I think the only possible point of view from which guardians of the poor can look upon distress (I use “distress” as meaning large numbers of men out of work), is the destitution of those men. I do not think that they could safely go into the causes of the destitution or alter their relief, or change their policy, I should rather say, in consequence.

846. In the case of a strike, would it be the duty of the guardians, however, to relieve the applicant if there was a possibility of his getting work?

In the case of a strike, taking first of all the case as affecting the men who
who actually struck, a great proportion of them would be in receipt, for some time, at least, of what is called strike-pay, and would not be destitute: but supposing they were destitute, from whatever cause, and applied to the guardians for relief, the guardians are bound to relieve them, and it would not be enough for a board of guardians to say, "You are on strike; you must go back to work"; in order to be safe they must show that the man can, by applying at a certain place at a certain time, get work.

847. If they can show that, does it relieve them from meeting the application by relief?
In that case the man is not destitute. But it must be remembered that that does not very often happen, because when the men have struck the works are shut up, unless an exceptional arrangement is made with the masters to keep some work going to offer to men who apply to the guardians; the men cannot get work; the master will not open the works to take on one or two or three hands.

848. Have you known cases in which that arrangement has been made?
Yes, I have known cases in which the masters of ironworks have said to the guardians, "Well, if any man applies to you we will give him work here." But it may be interesting to point out that there is a distinction to be drawn here between strikes and lock-outs. If the men are locked out, there is no possibility of their getting work; if the men are on strike, then the masters may make an arrangement, "All those who come to the guardians may come here and get work."

850. Have you any other illustration which you can give us from your experience; you mentioned South Wales?
There the strike happened in winter, and the destitution was very great; and there some of the masters did allow some of the men who had applied to the guardians to come and work. I believe that that strike lasted so long that the strike-pay was practically exhausted, and there certainly, in some instances, there was an attempt made to prevent the masters from locking out in order to facilitate the action of the guardians.

851. In addition to the strikes and the lock-outs, such periods of exceptional distress and destitution may be brought about by failure of trade and shifting of industries from one place to another?
Yes.

852. Have you any experience of that?
Yes, in Bradford, for about three years. Fashion changed, and Bradford goods were out of demand, and periods of distress occurred there; at one time there were between 800 and 900 men working on an outdoor labour test; and again at Middlesbrough, where labour at the ironworks suddenly ceased (they shut up the ironworks from various causes, partly from the introduction of steel rails), there was a considerable period of distress; it was in 1879, I think; and then it happened again four years ago in the same place from the same cause.

853. How was that met; what means were taken?
My experience is that all these periods of distress arising from men, from one cause or the other, being out of work are met in the same way. In the first place, the guardians relieve them as long as they can with orders for the workhouse, that is to say, generally speaking; and when they think that is rather hard measure for a certain class, they start an out-door labour test, and then, after a time, very frequently, as at Bradford and at Middlesbrough, they take the further step of appealing to the municipality or private employers to open
works for the men, in which the men shall be relieved by wages, not by relief. For instance, in Bradford I remember that the men helped to make a public park. In Middlesbrough, the last time I went down there, the guardians made an arrangement with the Tees Commissioners that a certain amount of embanking work should be done, and that men who applied to the relieving officer should be told to go over to the Tees Commissioners.

854. We have had some evidence as to the inexpediency of labour yards, the special institution of labour yards, except in periods of very exceptional distress; I do not want to go into that, but can you give us any idea of the precautions that were taken in any of the instances which you have mentioned, to prevent the evil effects of attracting workpeople from other places where the unemployed might hear that special works were being instituted.

Unfortunately, it is an inseparable accident of the system of labour yards, that it attracts a certain number of men back to them; for my experience is that a certain proportion of mankind would rather have an assured subsistence, though it is a very small one, than have to work in the open market for their living. It is not a peculiarity at all that attaches to the labouring classes. I think it exists in every class of life, and my experience is that those men will come back to any particular town when outdoor relief is given in the form of a labour test, and that has a tendency to make the labour yard chronic instead of being exceptional, and a sort of case of men out of employment is created; I have seen it frequently; I have known men stay 14 or 15 years working for a bare subsistence in a labour yard when they ought to have gone away and earned their living.

855. In all the cases which you have mentioned, was the conclusion of the period of distress the resumption of the same trade in the same district, or were the population permanently shifted elsewhere in any cases?

Generally it ended by the resumption of the same trade; but there is a great shifting after every period of distress. For instance, in the case of Middlesbrough, very large numbers of unskilled labourers, Irish labourers generally, left the town, and a great many of the iron-workers even tramped on their feet to South Wales to find work, but in times of strike men do not, as a rule, leave the place; they think that the strike may end any day and that they may just as well wait for that.

856. Are any exceptional regulations put in force as to the payment of the school fees out of the rates in the case of strikes?

The point of my evidence here rather is that guardians have to relieve the distress as they find it, and that it would not be the duty of guardians to go into the causes of distress, otherwise you might have guardians of the poor deciding whether a strike was a right strike or not; whether the masters were right or the men were right, which, of course, would be a most dangerous thing for any body having to administer public funds to do. Three years ago there was a case in a Yorkshire union where the colliers were on strike, and a large number of them applied for the payment of school fees for their children. Of course the guardians thought that the men ought not to have been on strike and that they should have saved enough to pay their own children's school fees; but the guardians are bound to pay school fees if they were satisfied of the poverty of the applicant, never mind how it arose, and so they were told they should pay the school fees.

857. Did the administration of the Poor Law actually break down from want of means in any of the cases that have come under your notice.

I have never seen the least sign that the Poor Law was likely to break down from want of means, the resources of the ratepayers being amply sufficient to deal with any destitution that ever occurs. Even such widespread destitution as that in Lancashire in 1877, when there were riots and houses were burnt, did not really raise the poor rate very much. But where the Poor Law runs a risk of breaking down temporarily is owing to the want of proper machinery, such as adequate surplus workhouse accommodation for the able-bodied men, and especially sufficient relieving officers.

858. Do
858. Do you mean that if in a period of exceptional distress workhouses become so crowded as not to be available for putting a test upon the under-serving, there would be risk of imposture? There would be risk of imposture, and there would be the risk also of real cases of hardship occurring: because it is unfortunately the system that paupers in receipt of outdoor relief get help from other sources, and a great many persons who might be able to live on the inadequate outdoor relief that the guardians give them in ordinary times would, in a time of strike, not be able to do so. They should come into the workhouse, and if there is not room in the workhouse for them, great suffering may be caused.

859. With regard to the other cause you mention, want of a proper number of relieving officers, how does that operate? The number of relieving officers may be sufficient for ordinary times, but in a time of strike the numbers of applicants go up very suddenly, and I have known that in one union two or three officers for the best part of a year had the charge of investigation into the circumstances of between 2,000 and 3,000 persons (2,500, I think, was the number), which is a perfectly impossible task; and, of course, that reacts upon the pauperism again, because the guardians are obliged to give relief without due investigation, and that encourages speculative applications for relief. In this way the crisis becomes more acute, and the number of applicants becomes greater.

860. What do you regard as the normal number of cases in a town union which one relieving officer can properly administer? I do not think that a relieving officer ought ever to have 500; but it varies a great deal with the nature of the trade and the character of the pauperism. I remember a case, a good many years ago now, where it came to my knowledge that a relieving officer was so deluged with applications for relief that he simply gave the men, as they applied, a shilling, to get rid of them, and wrote down their names as sudden and urgent cases. Of course, he was a weak man, but he was sorely tried.

861. How long did that go on? That went on for two or three days, when it got to be known, and steps were taken to relieve him of his duties and to make a better arrangement.

862. In some of these cases that you have mentioned, I suppose the position of the guardians would be one of great difficulty when considerable pressure would be put upon them from various quarters? Very great difficulty. Frequently, in a time of distress, which appeals to the public imagination, guardians are exposed to violent newspaper attacks by people who hardly realise what the Poor Law is meant to do, people, perhaps, whose sympathies are very much roused, to such an extent as to over-balance their judgment. The guardians have these newspaper attacks to meet, and they also have (as I have seen on two occasions) to meet the danger of riot. Guardians do not care to be supposed to refuse to give relief in such a way as to rouse public feeling and to run the risk of such events as we had in Lancashire in 1877, or as were threatened in Bradford at the last distress.

863. At such a time the orders of the Local Government Board would be a source of strength to the guardians? I think they are an immense source of strength to the guardians, because the guardians can say to the men, or to the people who attack them, "We are here carrying out a trust imposed upon us by the law, and the conditions of the trust are laid down in these orders, and these orders we must obey, or run the risk of having to pay the relief out of our own pockets," and that certainly weakens the personal pressure upon them.

864. If an election was to take place, at a time of great excitement, of the whole board of guardians, it would be liable to the danger of being unduly influenced by it, would it not? I should look upon it with considerable misgiving; for instance (it may be a groundless fear, but I have often thought of it), if trade union leaders wished to administer the Poor Law for the benefit, or the supposed benefit, of a particular trade, they might so influence an election of guardians as to elect the (70.)

Mr. Davy.
guardians who they thought would assist the strikers with means supplied from the poor rates; and it has always seemed to me that the safeguard against that was first the law, the orders of the Board, and next the good sense of the trades union leaders themselves.

865. Which is one argument in favour of a part of the board of guardians retiring at one time and part at another?

I do not like the system of a whole board of guardians being changed at once; I used to advocate it, but I have entirely changed my view.

866. There is one point I put to Mr. Hedley which I should like your opinion upon; you do not wish, as I understand, to fetter the discretion of the board of guardians more than it is fettered at the present time?

No.

867. But do you think that, in addition to the regulations issued from the central board, when boards of guardians come to entrust the giving of relief to committees of their own, it is desirable or not that they should issue orders of their own for the instruction and guidance of their committees?

I think that is essential, if we are to preserve uniformity of administration; and that is done, for instance, in Manchester, which is a notable instance of a case where, by the forms of procedure, they have managed to make their own bye-laws operative on their own members; but I should be disposed to go further, and allow the board of guardians to make at their own free will bye-laws regulating their procedure, or regulating the terms on which they should give relief, and have those bye-laws confirmed by the Local Government Board so as to give them the force of law; so that a breach of the bye-laws would have the same effect as the breach of an order, in the same way as with sanitary bye-laws.

868. Chairman.] An advantage of that would be that, inasmuch as the attendance is necessarily, perhaps, a very fluctuating one, it would not happen that particular members of the Board on one day might act totally opposite to the action of other members of the Board upon another day?

That is quite so.

869. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is there a precedent for that under the Sanitary Acts at the present time?

Yes, authorities submit bye-laws to the Local Government Board for sanction. I have known a case where relief is given (it is in the Leeds Union) by a large number of committees, and the guardians used to sit, always the same guardians and with the same officers, as committees for that part of the town from which they were elected. I do not suppose that you could imagine a worse financial scheme than that, that the relief should be paid out of the funds of the whole union at the discretion of guardians sitting for particular districts and administering relief to those particular districts from which they were elected. The board of guardians shuffled the cards and made a regulation that no guardian sit invariably with the same relieving officer and for the same district. The result was an enormous decrease in the amount of outdoor relief given. But such a regulation as that may be safely ignored by any section of the Board. A section of the Board may say: "You chose to pass that resolution, but we shall sit with the same committee." No board of guardians is strong enough to enforce that regulation. I say that if in their better mind they choose to pass a regulation of that sort they ought to have the chance of giving it the force of law.

870. Would you say the larger the district over which the rates are chargeable the more risk there is that the guardians belonging to any particular district would look out for the interest of that particular one?

That is so, if the areas of election have no relation whatever to the financial area, the area of burden.

871. Is there any difference between the prohibitory and the regulation orders on which you wish to comment?

The prohibitory order plus the out-door labour test order, which is a third order
order that is issued to enable guardians under the prohibitory order to give out-door relief, is very much the same as the regulation order. There are some minor points of difference, but the main practical point of difference is, that under one you can give outdoor relief to a mother with bastard children, and under the other you cannot; but I do not think myself that there is very much in those orders, because I find that the relief, as a rule, is better administered in those unions which are under the regulation order than it is in those under the prohibitory order.

872. Chairman.] Do you mean prohibitory order plus labour-test order? Yes, plus labour-test.

873. You think that absolutely the relief is better administered under the regulation order than under the prohibitory order.

It so happens, from various causes; of course, it is not a case of post hoc propter hoc; but my experience of the unions I have had under my charge with the regulation order is that they, as a matter of fact, regulate their relief better than those under the prohibitory order; and the rate of indoor pauperism, taking all England, is certainly higher in those unions that have the regulation order than in those that have the prohibitory order. Of course, there are many causes that may account for that, but I do not myself think that the order itself so much matters as the general character of the board of guardians.

874. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You are aware, I understand, of the special order which the Local Government Board has sanctioned in the case of the Whitechapel Board of Guardians, to give them permission to take the head of a family into the workhouse, and leave the others outside, for a specified time, giving the head of the family an opportunity of going out to seek for work?

Yes.

875. Have you anything to say in the light of your own experience as to such a policy as that?

It is a policy which I have very frequently recommended to boards of guardians without the order. Very often, almost invariably, when there is anything like a crisis, I recommend the guardians, as long as they can, to take the head of the family into the workhouse, and give outdoor relief to the wife and children. That regulation, by the way, is impossible under the prohibitory order, because it says that where an able-bodied man is relieved he and his wife and children must be relieved within the workhouse.

876. Can you give the Committee the considerations which guide you in recommending that action?

There is, first of all, the practical question that in times when there is a great rush of pauperism no workhouse could give accommodation to all the men and all the women and children applying for relief; it would be unreasonable to ask for such a surplus of accommodation as that. Secondly, I am a great adherent of the workhouse test. I do not believe in out-door labour tests; I believe that you should not have an out-door labour test until you are obliged to have it; that it is a bad thing for the people, a very bad thing for the ind. dependent labourer; and I think that is the best way of maintaining the workhouse as the test for as long as possible.

877. You would say, of course, that the real object of a labour test is to prevent an individual getting relief from the rates, and yet competing for wages at the same time as he is getting this relief?

That is an opinion which I hold very strongly. I do not think that a labour test as a test is very effective. My experience is that a labour test order is generally accepted, while a workhouse test order is generally refused. I should say that out of 50 labour test orders all would be accepted except two or three, and out of 50 workhouse orders all would be refused except two or three. The object of the labour test is to prevent a man from getting relief, and getting wages from any other source at the same time.

878. Are you referring to the case of Nottingham?

(70.) O  No,
No, I am thinking of a case in the Blackburn Union where times were very bad; it was right in the middle of that long strike, and the workhouse was full, and we had no labour for the men to do; and I suggested to the guardians that it would be better for the men to come into the dining hall and stand there doing nothing as their labour test, than to allow them to get relief and loaf about the town.

879. What was the result of that?
The result was, I believe, that the recommendation was to a certain extent enforced; the men got their dinners at the workhouse, and the guardians got through the difficulty somehow, the best that can be said of any period of acute distress.

880. You have heard Mr. Hedley's evidence as to the defect of the labour test; is there anything you wish to add to what he said?
I should like to say this: that the ordinary labour test, which is stone-breaking and oakum-picking, is to my mind a most objectionable form of labour, for this reason, that both stone-breaking and oakum-picking are highly skilled labour, and a man who has been in every gaol and workhouse in the county, who has served a long apprenticeship to the game, can do it quite easily and well, whereas the man whom you do not want to punish cannot break stones and cannot pick oakum. A really skilled tramp, a real expert at it, breaks stones like a conjuring trick, and knows every dodge; he is up to the dodges of the fiddle and the hot-water pipe, and the finger and nail for picking his oakum, and does it easily; and that is why the ordinary labour tests are to my mind unfair. I support them before boards of guardians on the principle that the men getting relief should not be able to earn wages at the same time. I would rather that they simply had the roll calls every half-hour than have no test; but the ordinary labour tests are unfair.

881. If they were idling about in a room would that not have a very bad effect upon those who are so much less hardened coming in contact with those who are skilled vagrants; tramps?
Yes; that is an inseparable difficulty of the labour test, when you get large bodies of men together.

882. Of any labour test?
Yes; and I do not think that that difficulty would be much increased if the men simply did nothing.

883. Chairman.] The association is practically the same?
Pretty nearly. In some north country unions, at Bradford, for instance, the guardians have built a large labour-test house for out-door men, and there they have a small separate cell. They have also some corn mills, which is on the whole the fairest labour test I know of, for any man can turn the mill.

884. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Have those separate cells worked well at Bradford?
They are better, because the men are easier kept in order.

885. Chairman.] Those labour-test houses have a good effect?
They have a very good effect in preventing the labour yard from becoming chronic; that is the thing we have to avoid. We may be driven by stress of weather to start a labour yard, but unless that labour yard is properly administered it becomes chronic, and the surplus labour in a great many cases does not distribute itself as it should and would do under proper management.

886. Lord Balfour of Burley.] In the case of Bradford, which you are speaking of, the separate cells you mention are cells for them to labour in?
Yes.

887. And they sleep otherwise, just as they would if there were no separate cells to work in?
Yes, it is merely a covered shed, because, of course it is impossible to enforce any test in bad weather.

888. Have
888. Have you anything to say about the system of giving part of the relief in kind? 
Yes, the orders of the Board say that when an able-bodied man is relieved out of the house he shall be set to work, and half his work shall be paid in kind. Relief in kind was strongly advocated by the early Poor Law Commissioners; they always argued that that was a self-acting test of destitution, that a man could not get drunk with bread. But it is found there are great difficulties in the administration of such relief, unless there is a proper organisation; for instance, now the price of bread has fallen so much that it is difficult to give a man enough relief in kind so as to make up half the amount necessary to keep him.

889. But the bread will not be any less nutritious because it is cheap?
No; but you have to diminish his money relief as well, so as to bring it down to the half, and the money you gave him would be too little to pay his lodging or firing.

890. Chairman.] That only applies under the special order about giving half; would not the guardians have discretion?
No; that forms an objection, because the order becomes an order that is practically ignored, and it should not be; all orders should be carried out; and the other objection is that tickets have to be given on shops. What becomes of the tickets that are given by the relieving officer on the shop no one can tell; they may be exchanged for another ticket for something else, or sold for money. But what I should like to bring before the Committee as a really practical suggestion for large towns, is a system which prevails in Manchester, where the guardians have a store, and if a man has a ticket for, say 3s. in kind, he goes to the store, and the storekeeper, like the banker's clerk, says, "How will you have it?" "I will have so much bread, so much sugar, so many candles, so much flour;" and he gets it given to him then and there. The effect of that is that he gets it at cost price, that he gets it good, and that he cannot do any mischief with it.

891. Chairman.] But, speaking generally, would you be in favour of giving a portion of the relief in kind in all cases of out-door relief?
I suppose I ought to say I should, because that is the doctrine which has been approved by the Board.

892. What is your own opinion?
My own opinion is that that does not matter. I think, unless a man can be trusted to spend his money properly, he ought not to be getting out-door relief at all.

893. But may not the guardians, by a proper management of the system of supplying in kind, diminish considerably the cost by supplying the provisions at cost price?
Yes; that is the real advantage.

894. To that extent it is an advantage; for example, where people are in the habit of baking their own bread, a certain portion of flour would be supplied at a much lower rate than it is possible for them to buy it at?
Yes.

895. And in cases where meat tickets are given, if a contract is made with the butcher that meat shall be supplied at a certain price, and no more, do you see any objection to that?
That is already a great economy; but I take it that your questions refer to ordinary relief; I am only thinking of extraordinary relief.

896. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Another objection we have had represented to us to the labour yards is, that they give colour to the belief in the mind of many that they have a claim to labour from either municipal or State organisation; have you anything to say upon that point?
That is, of course, an enormous danger, which will have to be probably fought out in England by-and-by; but up to the present time I have never seen
seen any widespread indication of that feeling on the part of the men. It has often been stated in newspapers that the municipalities should find work for them as a matter of right; but I do not think the paupers themselves have ever got it into their heads.

897. Chairman.] Would you apply that opinion to rural districts as well as towns?
Yes, I think so, except some isolated cases.

898. You do not think that the opinion prevails amongst labourers in rural districts that they are entitled either to work or relief?
No, I do not think so.

899. Lord Balfour of Burley.] I think it would be interesting if you could tell us shortly how that claim is dealt in Germany?
Judging from the many conversations I had with German poor law administrators, they seem to be afraid of that claim being set up. They say that they would prefer to relieve the men without work; they would say, "We never find work for a man;" "We would never set a man to work," or set a pauper on work, as the Statute of Elizabeth says; "We prefer that a man should find work for himself;" and really they are afraid of starting the principle; that is my opinion.

900. Could you give us any indication how this special problem is being dealt with in Germany?
In Berlin they have a very short and sharp way of dealing with the unemployed, which rather illustrates the feelings of the same class, the official class. When a man applies for relief there, on the ground that he has no lodgings and is out of work, they allow him to go to the House of Refuge, if he is a single man for five days, if a married man for 14 days, but they warn him by a written paper which they hand to him that if at the end of five or 14 days, as the case may be, he does not find a house and work he will be taken before the magistrate, and unless he can convince the magistrate that he has used every effort to find a house and work he will go to gaol for from six months to two years.

901. You wish to say something about dock labour?
The casual dock labour which in England is sometimes a great difficulty. For instance, in one Liverpool union if a man finds work at the dock he works there, and gets his wage; if he does not he goes straight to the relieving officer and gets an order for the stoneyard, and works there.

902. You mean if he is not fortunate in the work he is offered at the dock the stoneyard affords him a means of getting work?
He gets over it that day by going to the stoneyard, and I have no doubt you will have evidence as to the great difficulty of dealing with that casual dock labour.

903. Can you state the system which is in force in Antwerp?
There the dockyard labourers formed themselves into corporations, "nations," as they call themselves, and they undertake to do the work. The contract is made with the corporation, and the corporation provide the men and keep the men; it is a trade guild, in fact.

904. Chairman.] How does that bear on the question of poor relief; if the labour runs short so that men who belong to any of these corporations are out of work, what then?
Then the corporations keep them; it is a sort of trade society as well.

905. Lord Balfour of Burley.] We have more than once had represented to us the desirability of increased co-operation between the work of charitable societies and the public work of the guardians; would you say that where such co-operation can be established, applications ought to be made to the poor law authorities or to the charitable societies?
It would be an immense advantage if the charitable societies and the poor law were brought into more intimate connection, and it would be a great advantage
tage if some means could be devised that the first application should be made to the charitable society, and then the case referred back to the poor law; because it seems to me a great danger which was realised at the time of the cotton famine, that men might apply to the poor law in order to be put on to the charity; and I have seen indications that there was that risk in the few towns where co-operation between the charitable societies and the poor law is, at all events, beginning to be established.

906. Could you not make some distinction between the class of cases which ought to be dealt with by the one organisation and those which should come under the sphere of the other?

That is the difficulty, and that is a necessity; a classification must be made.

907. Could you give us any indication, from your experience, of what has been done in any of these exceptional times of distress, in the way of separating the one class from the other?

Yes. Almost always in times of distress there is a charitable fund formed. In times of strike they would confine themselves to the women and children or those who were not actually concerned in the strike; but in times of ordinary distress the fund would be for everybody; and when it is well managed the person distributing charitable relief put themselves into communication with the relieving officer, and very often put the guardians on their committee, so that cross relief should be as far as possible avoided.

908. You would not bring that connection between charity and the poor law only into being at the time of exceptional period of distress, would you?

I should like to see it occur always, because the risk in all poor law relief is that the sound principle which is made for the benefit of the class of people who live by labour may be broken down by hard cases; hard cases are the bane of all pauper legislation.

909. Must it not in practice be the case that people will apply in the first instance to the poor law authorities?

Yes, that must be so in practice. What was in my mind would be this, that where an application is made to the relieving officer he should exercise a sort of judgment by sending the applicant across to the charity people at once without the case coming through the pauper books.

910. That of course could only be done by a union of working, and a preconcerted plan on the part of those carrying it out?

A union of working and a preconcerted plan; and I should say that until the charity organisation societies, so called, in the manufacturing towns in the north are put on a better and sounder basis, that is to say are not mere dole societies, it will be difficult for the guardians to really rely upon them.

911. Coming now to the question of vagrancy, have you anything to say as regards the system of relief presently pursued in regard to vagrants?

On the point of definition or on the point of the general policy, do you mean?

912. I will take the general policy in the first place. Is the relief given to them in a wise way, and in a way that is likely to tend to their reformation or to harden them in their career; that is the sort of point I should like you to address yourself to?

Now that the powers of detention have been increased, I do not wish to express any opinion in favour of those powers of detention, but now that they have been increased, and now that vagrant wards are, owing to the efforts of the Poor Law Inspectors I suppose principally, being made more suitable for the purpose, the real old tramp has left the road; I do not see him any more, and there has been a decrease in the total number of tramps. So far that is good; but I have not got much good to say of the principle of vagrant relief in England at the present moment, for this reason, that a tramp when he is discharged is discharged just as destitute as when he came in.
913. Can you help that?
Not under the present system of allowing vagrant men to go on and on; I do not see that you can help it.

914. But can you suggest any system by which you can obviate that?
No, I cannot suggest any system which has the least chance of being enforced; but I have always been of opinion that the police should deal with tramping as a thing to be suppressed.

915. But there must be migration of labour from one class of labour to the other, and from one town to another?
There must be migration of labour.

916. How are the very poor to go except by road?
It seems a hard thing to say, but I do not think that they should be helped to be moved by the State, because incidentally the evil of vagrancy is much greater than the good which will be got by individuals.

917. But would you say that there has been a diminution of vagrancy in the counties?
That there has been a diminution of tramping I think is clear from the statistics which the Board have twice, I think, obtained since Mr. Pell's Act for the increased detention of vagrants was passed.

918. But might not the increased detention act as a deterrent not to the tramping, but to the asking for and obtaining State assistance?
I do not quite follow.

919. I understand you to say that you think there is a decrease of tramping and vagrancy; the figures which you seem to rely upon do not necessarily go further than this, that there is only a diminution in those who ask for accommodation in vagrant wards?
That is quite so; they may be at the lodging-houses.

920. You have not with you, I suppose, those statistics to which you refer?
I have not.

921. Could you furnish them to the Committee?
Yes.

922. Chairman.] The general statistics you could get us?
Yes.

923. Lord Balfour of Burley.] In regard to the treatment of vagrants, is there any attempt at uniformity throughout the country?
There is a constant attempt at uniformity on the part of the Local Government Board, but unfortunately it has not been so successful as perhaps it deserved to have been. First of all, there is a want of uniformity in the matter of diet. The orders of the Board allow two sorts of diet; a man may get six ounces of bread and a pint of gruel; or he may get eight ounces of bread and so many ounces of cheese; that is a difference which, to those who do not know, seems a small and unimportant difference, but it is not. The offer of hot gruel in cold weather will draw tramps as surely as possible; if you stop the gruel the tramps show a visible falling off; that has been my universal experience.

924. It takes no long time for a change like that to come into operation?
They know it in a week.

925. Is there any other point in connection with vagrancy you would like to suggest to the Committee?
There is this: it rather goes to the question of neglected children, vagrant children. I do not know whether any questions will be put to me about that or about the German system.

926. Will you state anything you wish to say?
It seems to me that women going about with children selling things might
be dealt with as they are dealt with in some North German towns. There
nobody is allowed to sell anything without a license, or schen; and these women
who go about selling matches and oranges might be refused a license, if they
dragged children about with them.

927. Is it not the fact that at the present time, if the law was strictly
enforced, selling even a small article in the street would be illegal?
I think not; I do not think selling articles of food would be illegal.

928. Chairman.] But take matches; can you tell us would selling matches be
contrary to law?
I cannot say that with absolute certainty, but as a matter of practice the
courts never interfere; but it always seemed to me that it was a practicable
reform, that if these women were not allowed to sell anything without a license
we should be able to stop that particular form of vagrancy, because they never
go about without selling?

929. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Turning to another point, you would be in
favour of getting children who are chargeable to the rates as much out of the
workhouse as possible?
I am very strongly in favour of sending those workhouse children that have
to be in the workhouse to the public elementary schools.

930. But where they can be so dealt with, do you like the system of sending
them to cottage homes, or boarding them out with families in their own station
of life?
I like the separate school built on the cottage home plan, provided the schools
are not too large; that is not boarding out.

931. I coupled them together; I know the difference; do you object to the
boarding out?
I have seen a large number of children boarded-out both within the union
and outside the union, and my experience is that the children almost always
do well, and one sees many pretty cases of adoption by the foster parents;
but I never can reconcile my mind to what I think the injustice of boarding
out.

932. What do you refer to?
I mean an objection which was put by the late Mr. Fawcett very strongly,
which seems to be ignored now. It does not seem to me to be fair or just
that a pauper child should have more money spent upon him than the independ-
ent labourer can possibly spend upon his children.

933. Chairman.] I asked a question of the previous witness on this point,
whether there was not this distinction; that in the case of the child of the
labourer the latter is expected to make some sacrifice of a portion of his own
living in order to support his children, but that in the case of a child of another
person he could not be called upon to make the smallest sacrifice, therefore
there is that distinction.
That is a distinction which might or might not occur to the labourer; but I
think what would occur to him would be that the poor child was better off to
his extent of, perhaps, 2 s. a week, and the certainty of good medical attendance
and clothing than his own children were, however hard he might labour for
them.

934. But does that objection apply with equal force to the cottage homes?
There the children are under certain disabilities; they are taken out of the
daily life of the village, and I do not think it would have the same effect on the
minds of the labouring classes as it would if the children were actually with
them.

935. But all these boarded-out children must be either orphans or deserted
children.
There is a very wide latitude allowed as to what "deserted" means.

936. Take the case of orphan children; do you think the objection would
apply there, because every one would recognise that the orphan child is in a
peculiar
peculiar position and has to be cared for by some one, and therefore in that sense does not compete with other children in the same class.

I remember an ingenious calculation made by a man in a north country town in which he pointed out that if you had six children and 600 l., it was your bounden duty in that town to dissipate the 600 l. or give it away before you died, because each of your children would be better under the care of the guardians with 4 s. 6 d. a week and clothing and a certainty of the medical attendance, than if you left each of them 100 l. It sounds grotesque, but there is an element of truth in it, I think.

937. Earl of Onslow.] When you say that the child is better off by 2 s. a week than a child of the labourer’s, you do not take into your calculation, do you, the remuneration that has to be paid to the foster parent, and which goes to the foster parent, and not to the child.

No, I did not take that into the calculation. What was running in my mind was something like this: A man, say with 12 s. a week, three or four children besides himself and his wife to keep, average perhaps 2 s. a week or 2 s. 6 d. a week; into that family comes another child whose parent has not taken any pains with him, and 4 s. 6 d. a week is the sum calculated for that particular child.

938. But how much of the 4 s. 6 d. goes to the support of the child, and how much of the 4 s. 6 d. goes to the remuneration of the foster parent for taking care of him?

That, I admit, is a weak point in my argument.

939. Lord Balfour of Burley.] How long does any control or supervision of the guardians last over children when they leave either the foster parents’ home, or the cottage home?

The law seems to me there to be curiously defective, because the control is to the age of 16 or to the end of the time of leaving the first situation. Now, of course, a child that leaves its first situation is one who is specially in need of the care of the guardians, and yet the law seems to limit the supervision of the guardians to the end of the first situation, I suppose because it is felt that if a child is earning wages it is no longer a pauper, it is not destitute, and therefore is outside the control of the guardians.

940. It works unequally in this way, that where a child remains one month in its first situation the supervision will then come to an end, and if it remains five years in it, it will go on for all that time?

That is so, if my reading of the law is correct; but, practically, a good board of guardians ignore the law, and make a rule that any change in the situation of the child should be reported to them. But I should just like to add that it seems to me that, with regard to the supervision of children who are sent out from workhouse-es, the record of the careers of children is kept in a most imperfect way very often. The form is bad; you have a row of children down on the book as having come back to the workhouse, but against their names no reason stated why they came back; and there are boards of guardians spending enormous sums on their schooling, and taking pains about that, and not taking the pains to keep an exact record of what becomes of the children afterwards.

941. Chairman.] Have you observed that there is very often great latitude in keeping the important records that ought to be kept of the various details connected with cases of all kinds?

It is very lax; so that it is impossible to meet an attack or to get up evidence on any point.

942. Lord Balfour of Burley.] I understand the corresponding system in Germany is, in your opinion, very complete?

So far as the general pauper records are concerned they are very complete.

943. And care of children:

There the system varies, as it does in England; but, as a rule, the children are boarded out.

944. Is
944. Is there any point in connection with that system that you think could be advantageously adopted in this country?

So far as the neglected children are concerned? That is a point that I think should be considered by us. There, if a man is a drunkard, and neglects his children, or his wife is a prostitute, the municipality, or the poor law portion of the municipality, may charge him with—I think the charge runs that he is morally dead; and if the Court finds that he is unfit for the charge of his children those children are handed over to the Poor Law, and the father forfeits all rights to them, and he himself is very likely sent to gaol, but need not necessarily be sent to gaol on the same day.

945. If he is not sent to gaol, do not you think there are a considerable number of persons who would not object to be "morally dead"?

A very large number.

946. Previous witnesses have told us that the care of the sick and the infirm in workhouses has greatly improved in the last few years; that, I presume, is your experience also.

It has enormously improved; it would be difficult really to describe the very great improvement that has taken place with regard to the care of the sick in workhouses.

947. Would you go so far as to say that, as a matter of fact, it is decidedly superior to that which the independent poor can provide for themselves?

I think there is no doubt that it is superior, and I should think that in a good many towns it is quite equal, or even superior, to the sick accommodation provided in the charitable infirmaries.

948. Actually superior?

Of course the class of cases are different, but certainly the buildings are, as a rule, superior to any infirmary except the most modern ones. The Poor Law Board now insist upon every possible sanitary regulation in the buildings being carried out.

949. It seems that there have been complaints with respect to the hardship of separating people who have been married for a length of time, and who have to go into the workhouses; is it not the fact that above a certain age there is facility for them to live together, if they desire it at the present time?

If they are both above 60, they are, under quite an old statute, entitled to live together. If one of them is above 60, under a more recent statute they may, if the guardians think fit, live together. But on that point I should like to say that the last time I took any statistics on the question was in Yorkshire, and there, getting indoor relief, out of over 10,000 paupers there were altogether 27 married couples. Out of those 27 couples eight were paralysed, or in such a state that they could not possibly be removed from the infirmary. 11 lived together, and the balance refused to live together.

950. Practically, over that large district, the separating of married couples was in no sense a grievance?

It is in no sense a grievance, and I may say that in some north country workhouses they actually have built cottages into which the married couples can go, but you find that, as a rule, these cottages are not occupied by the married couples, but by the more decent old women; and only the other day I was sent down to a board of guardians to tell them that the law must be carried out, and that they must provide for a certain married couple who had complained that they were kept apart. The board of guardians who were about to build a new workhouse had to consent, and spent a large sum of money in providing a room for them. As soon as the room was complete, the married couple declined to live together, which was rather discouraging.

951. Have you anything to say as to the variation of practice prevailing in different unions, both inside and outside the workhouses, in the provision of stimulants?

Yes. The quantity of stimulants ordered varies immensely; it varies from a very few shillings to almost over a pound a head in the year. I may put it (70.)
that in some unions it is as low as a penny a head, and in some it is as high as a pound a head in the year. Some unions absolutely give nothing at all; in several north country unions that is so, but that is a matter in the discretion of the medical officer.

952. Can you see any way of getting it out of the discretion of the medical officer with justice to the medical officer, and the administration of relief? I think not, so far as medicine to the sick goes; but I think care should be taken lest it should be given as an indulgence. I mean to say that stimulants should be put in the category of medicine, and not in the category of food; that is my opinion. I should like to say that in one union they decline ever to give stimulants to an out-door pauper, on the ground that that is a medicine that cannot be safely administered in the people's own homes, and that the only way of safely administering stimulants is inside the workhouse.

953. The supposition being that if they were in such a dangerous state of health as to require stimulants they would come into the house to get them? Yes.

954. Chairman.] They do not apply that rule in very urgent pressing cases of illness?

No.

955. Earl Spencer.] In the district which you are acquainted with, taking first the towns, are there many clubs which administer medical relief?

Yes, especially in Yorkshire, there are a good many sick clubs and burial clubs.

956. And do they take a good many cases that might otherwise come under the Poor Law?

They take a very large number of cases.

957. And where these exist is there a lesser amount of Poor Law relief?

There is a lesser amount of Poor Law relief in those districts, and I am certainly of opinion that some part of the difference is to be accounted for by the existence of the clubs.

958. It makes the people more independent; it has a good effect, not only on the immediate question of pauperism, but it has a good effect upon their character.

959. Does it apply to the country as well as to the town districts?

Yes, there are many good clubs in the country districts.

960. Do these clubs include the cases of women in childbirth?

No, as a rule cases of women in childbirth are excluded from the club; but very often the club has a stipulation that cases of childbirth shall be treated by the club doctor at a fixed fee, say 10s.

961. Lord Thring.] I should like to ask you a question about the election of boards of guardians; would you approve of election by rotation, one quarter or one-fifth going out periodically, so as to preserve the continuity in the board.

Where the elections are triennial I should. I should disapprove of a complete change every three years.

962. But supposing you had your own way and made a local board, what sort of election would you make it; would you make them go out one-third every two years or every three years?

One-third every year. As I said before, I have entirely changed my view about that, because I have seen a whole board of guardians elected simply on politics, and turned clean out and another board put in.

963. You would not have it one-third every two years, but one-third every year?

I do not think the Guardians ought to be free from the control of the rate-payers for more than a year.

964. With
964. With respect to vagrants allowing their children to be neglected; would you approve of a law by which parents are made directly responsible for the acts of their young children; or example, in the case of a child stealing, would you approve of a law by which the parent was fined for that? I have never considered that point; it is quite new to me.

965. Earl of Aberdeen.] There has been a very great and beneficial restriction on out-door relief throughout the country generally, has there not? A very great restriction on out-door relief, and a consequent falling in the total rate of pauperism.

966. Has there been any corresponding restriction, or attempt at restriction, in the abuse of indoor relief. I mean such abuse as that of the relief of the ins and outs, as they are called; persons of rather depraved character who go into the house for a time and come out when they wish to have a little liberty, and then return again?

No, I do not think there is. Of course there are many complaints of these in-and-out people, but I can hardly explain how it is why some unions are quite free from them, and other unions suffer from them; perhaps it is that the workhouse master in certain cases makes it a little hard for the in-and-out men.

967. He is compelled to admit a man who applies, is he not? If it is a sudden or urgent case he must admit him there and then.

968. Have cases come under your notice where people have habitually applied for their discharge from the workhouse, and then applied for re-admission after a short time?

Yes, there are such cases, and they are the worst cases; and where women will discharge themselves from the house for a fair, or when the Militia is out, or obviously for an immoral purpose, the guardians have no power to stop them, and they have no power to refuse them re-admission. I have known boards of guardians in the case of men put those men into the vagrants' wards for a time, or keep them in the receiving wards for a week; but that course, although it is very excusable, and, perhaps, very proper, is strictly illegal.

969. Chairman.] Do you at all approve of the suggestion that was made by the previous witness, that all persons admitted into a workhouse should be liable to be detained one week?

Administratively speaking, it would be a convenience; but I have a great dread of doing anything which would tend to lessen the purely voluntary character of the English workhouse; I believe that it is a point of immense importance in Poor Law administration, that the workhouse should be a place that a man can discharge himself from at once, and I do not think that the mere administrative convenience would at all compensate for the breach of the voluntary principle.

970. And there is a class of paupers, is there not, namely women, who come into a workhouse habitually for the purpose of being confined, upon whom the week's rule would have no effect?

Yes, that is a very awkward class.

971. Do you see any mode whatever of dealing with that class so as to prevent the use of the workhouse for the purpose of bringing into the world successive bastard children at short intervals of time.

A strong board of guardians, with a strong chairman, very often in my experience has put a great check on that practice by simply refusing to give the woman an order; they say to her parents, "At all events, you have a house, and you must keep the girl there during her confinement; you should have looked after her better," and they put some pressure on the parents in that way. But it is a very risky thing to do, because the parents might turn the girl out into the streets; but where they have a house, I think something might be done in the way of making the relations and friends look after these women themselves.

(70.)
972. Earl of Aberdeen.] Do not some guardians make an effort to charge the putative father with the cost of the woman in the lying-in ward.

I have never known that done; I do not think there would be any possibility of doing it.

973. In your admirable report on the German system you mention at page 35, speaking of Bremen, that there are two workhouses, one under the control of the police, and another called the voluntary workhouse in which persons of quite a different character are received; do you think that any step in that direction could be adopted in connection with our present system in England.

I do not. I think that the principle of that voluntary workhouse simply concedes logically the right to labour, because it is a place where a man is kept at the expense of the municipality by the work being found for him; he is not pauperised; he is simply employed at wages, and he earns as much wages as he can; whereas, of course, my strong opinion is that no public body should pay wages at all, that they must pay relief and not wages; but in Bremen they pay wages, and their numbers are already increasing in a very ominous way.

974. Less wages than what would be paid in the market?
They try to pay less wages than what would be paid in the market.

975. Have complaints been made on behalf of the working classes in the town where the system is carried out?
The system is only just started. I think the test of the system will come by-and-bye, in case it gets bigger.

976. Then I infer from that, that you agree in the propriety of what you mentioned as uniformly done, abstaining from acting upon the principle of the Statute of Elizabeth, of finding work?
The Statute of Elizabeth says that the poor shall be "set on work," which, of course, is ambiguous; it may mean a labour test in our sense, or it may mean that a sufficient quantity of stores shall be procured, and a regular workshop set up; but I am quite sure that whatever the meaning of the Statute of Elizabeth was, it would have been most unsafe for any public body to do anything more than give relief for destitution.

977. With regard to the decrease in the number of tramps, did you base your remarks as to that simply on the number admitted to the vagrant wards?
Yes, the last return was based on that.

978. But I mean as to your own opinion, as to the number being less than it was in former years?
Yes.

979. Is not it your own observation that in some districts they have increased very largely?
In some unions.

980. To what do you attribute the increase?
It fairly puzzles me; I do not know.

981. You do not think it is owing to the increased strictness of the regulations in connection with the vagrant wards in certain districts?
In some cases of increase you can definitely trace it to the fact that the neighbours have got more strict. Of course, any increased strictness in one district tends to throw tramps on to another, and that is the reason why uniformity is so desirable.

982. Chairman.] You have observed a general increase in these districts, I understand?
In certain unions in these districts. It is a sort of paradox which is quite defensible, that in the question of dealing with tramps it is better to be uniformly a little wrong than here and there perfectly right.

983. Earl
983. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have you heard much grumbling about the expense of boarding out children?
No; to the union it is probably an economy, compared with the expense if the Guardians had to build a school.

984. I am speaking rather with reference to your observation as to the apparent unfairness in the fact that a pauper child should be having more money spent on its upbringing than a labourer would be able to afford for his own children?
No, I have not heard any complaints on that specific point, probably for the reason that the child costs no more boarded out than he would inside the workhouse.

985. Is there not also a feeling amongst the respectable members of the working class that to be a pauper child at all is a sufficient calamity without reference to what alleviation there may be of that lot?
That I cannot say; but they have only just begun the system in England; it has not been going on long enough for us to know very much about the ulterior effects.

986. You would not cancel the permission as to husbands and wives being together in the workhouse?
Certainly not; and I would always insist to the utmost of my ability that the guardians should carry out the law.

987. There has been a good deal of ignorance on the part of some boards of guardians as to what the law is in that, and in some other matters, has there not.
Yes; probably because in an ordinary union a married couple living in their own house get out-relief, as a matter of course, and so the question has not arisen. and then the point of law often escapes the attention of the guardians.

988. Earl of Strafford.] Did I understand your previous answer that you gave with regard to the boarding out of children, that you prefer yourself that they should be sent to elementary schools rather than to cottage homes?
No; what I say as to elementary schools is that I should prefer that the children should be sent out of the workhouse or the cottage homes or the separate school, whatever it may be, to an elementary school, rather than that they should be kept in one school altogether.

989. You do not give a preference to their being cared for in the elementary school rather than in the cottage homes?
The child would be kept in the cottage home, or in the workhouse, so far at its food and its lodging was concerned, but it would go out to school, and it ought to go out to school, to the public elementary school of the neighbourhood, with the other children; that is my opinion.

990. Earl of Milftown.] But do they not go out from the cottage homes?
Yes, the system of sending children out to school is increasing every day, I am happy to say.

991. I suppose the children of these cottage homes go to some school?
Yes; but I say that the school ought to be the public elementary school, and not a special school attached to the institution.

992. With regard to the power of detaining a pauper five days, I understood you to say just now that you objected to it as rather a restraint on the freedom, which is one of the principles of the English Poor Law?
Yes.

993. But surely under the English law there is power of detention; it is simply enlarging that power?
Yes, there is a power of detention; there is a power of detention in regard to tramps, and a power of detention under the Admission and Discharge Act with regard to ordinary inmates who discharge themselves, that they must give a certain amount of notice?
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094. As the law now stands there is a power of detaining them, whether they like it or not, for two days, and under certain circumstances for three?  
**Yes.**

095. So that it would be simply enlarging a power already possessed:  
I think it would be hardly so. The question that was put was whether before a man came in it should be made a condition of his admission.

096. **Chairman.** Whether every man or woman admitted into the workhouse should be liable to be detained for one week as a condition of admission; that was the question which was put to you?  
**Yes.**

097. Earl of **Milltown.** With regard to your suggestion as regards vagrants and police, I do not quite understand what that is; is it that the Vagrant Act should be more strictly enforced.  
I have always wished that the question of vagrancy should be dealt with as a question of police, and not as a question of Poor Law.

098. What would that mean?  
It would mean that the class vagrants should not be recognised at all. A man who applied to the workhouse, if destitute, should be admitted as an ordinary pauper; if he begged in the streets the police should apprehend him and put the penalties of the Vagrant Act in force.

099. But that is the law now, is it not?  
Very often now the police are actually employed to give tickets of admission to vagrants.

1000. But it is quite illegal for a man to beg in the streets now?  
Perfectly.

1001. What I imagined was that your suggestion was that the Vagrant Act should be put in force; that is what it comes to?  
Yes, in any case.

1002. **Chairman.** But the Vagrant Act can only be put in force against a man who begs, or who is found sleeping out at night; the Vagrant Act has no application to a man who simply asked a policeman whether he can get relief at the workhouse?

No.

1003. And what the policeman in some cases does is to direct him to the relieving officer or himself give him a ticket for relief at the workhouse?

That is a very common thing.

1004. But the policeman would have no power to bring the man before the magistrates?

No.

1005. Earl of **Milltown.** But you suggest that he should?

No, I do not. We have gone too far to do that; we have built vagrant wards, and specially recognised the class of vagrant, and we have made our regulations for him, and treat him as if he were not wholly a pauper; partly as a criminal, because we compulsorily detain him and make him work, but, generally speaking, we treat him as a special class of pauper. Now, I cannot help wishing that the Poor Law had never had anything to do with the separation of the class of vagrants at all: that men who go tramping from place to place should have been carefully watched; that the Vagrant Act should have been strictly enforced, so that, when they did beg they were taken before magistrates, and that the magistrates should have had the much-needed pressure put upon them to carry out the law; and that everybody who applied to the guardians should have been treated just as the ordinary pauper, and admitted to the workhouse.

1006. **Earl Spencer.** Do you consider that the vagrant is better or worse treated
treated than the ordinary inmate of a workhouse; if you did away with that special class, I suppose he would be like the ordinary inmate?

He would be like the ordinary inmate; he would be passed through the wards; he would be admitted through the receiving ward, sleep his night in the receiving ward, and be admitted into the workhouse, and then he might discharge himself from there.

1007. Then is the present system, which you say has been developed with regard to vagrants, stricter or more lenient than the ordinary treatment of paupers?

By itself I should say it is stricter; but if the police really carried out universally the Vagrant Act with regard to men begging in the street, the two taken together would make the life of a vagrant less pleasant than it is now.

1008. He would find himself in the lock-up rather than in the workhouse?

Yes.

1009. Chairman.] But would there not be a great objection to the professional vagrant mixing in the workhouse with the ordinary pauper?

Yes, I think there might be an objection, but I think the vagrant class has been to some extent created.

1010. Earl Spencer.] Is it not a matter of classification rather than anything else.

Yes, it is a matter of classification.

1011. Chairman.] But if you classed vagrants by themselves in a new class, that would not vary very much from the present practice?

What it comes to is this: that the Vagrant Act should be enforced by the police much more strictly than now.

1012. A certain number of men, undoubtedly, would desire to discharge themselves immediately, and you would have a vast amount of trouble in taking these men into a receiving ward, clothing them, and then again re-clothing them in their own clothes when they discharged themselves; would not it be the same evil.

I admit that it is too late now; because we have created the class, and created the wards, and we must deal with them as best we may under the present system.

1013. Earl Spencer.] In your district has there been in any of the towns an influx of labourers seeking employment lately?

I think not. We used to have the trouble in Liverpool of men landing from Ireland trying to find something to do; but I do not think that has been the case in recent years.

1014. Not in the winter, when employment has been scarce?

No, there has never been any considerable number of people of that kind, subject to this limitation, that I have known men who were getting relief under a labour test in a town in one winter go all over the country in the summer, and come back to the same town in the winter.

1015. And they belonged to the town and not to the country?

Yes, they were townsmen.

1016. You have no reason to think that there has been an immigration into the towns of agricultural labourers in want of employment?

Not to any large extent. I have seen a good many cases of it, but nothing like a general movement.

1017. Nothing very remarkable?

Nothing very remarkable; and I must say that the men who came to the towns, men I happen to know, have done well; they probably displaced the Londoner.

1018. From being stronger?

I speak only from a few instances, but that is what I hear.
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1020. This vagrant class we have been talking of are a class by themselves; they are not people out of employment in the country or in the town?

I think that the vagrant class is recruited from the class of the unemployed; I think a certain number of men get on the road, perhaps, from an honest motive of finding work in another place; and then, to a certain class of mind, the vagrant's life being attractive, and they become vagrants; but within the last two years I have noticed, and the workhouse masters I have asked have noticed also, that the class of vagrants has very much altered, that there are very many more men who have just come on the road who are artisans than there used to be. I think we have driven off the real old cadger who used to sing and sell ballads, and that sort of man, and this other kind, a rather better kind, have taken their place.

1021. And do they come from any particular place, either in town or country?

No; but I was struck the other day by meeting in a Kent workhouse a man who was a puddler. He said it was bad trade in the ironworks, and he gradually drifted down here; and I am sure that fellow will be a tramp all his life.

1022. Earl of Aberdeen.] He wanted employment?

That is the way it begins, and then if a man has little backbone and likes wandering about, he becomes a tramp.

1023. Earl Spencer.] Are they single men generally, or do they tramp with their families?

They are nearly all single men, or, at least, will say that they are single men.

1024. Chairman.] Have you heard that the new vagrant wards are less popular, although more popular than the old ones, because there is no association?

I have heard that said very often, but I have heard the other thing said also very often.

1025. Which do you think is the truth?

I think myself that the tramp, the man with the tramping mind, gets used to anything, and what he dislikes is any innovation. He disliked the separate cell at first and he disliked the comparative cleanliness of the new ward, but he has got accustomed to it, and I think he would rather dislike not having a bath now. I believe that is about the truth of the matter, but it is very difficult to get at it really.

1026. You seemed to be of opinion that there was some disadvantage in there not being a continuous supervision of a child who had been placed out in service after the first engagement; but is there not the reason for discontinuing the supervision as soon as possible, that you wish to disconnect the child altogether from the workhouse and from workhouse associations?

There is that drawback; and for that reason I think that the officer who generally does the inspection of these children is the wrong officer; I would not give it to the relieving officer at all. The best system I am acquainted with is the one prevailing at the Swinton Schools at Manchester, where all the girls sent out to service are periodically visited by two old women, who have been there, one as an industrial trainer, and the other as a needlewoman, for many years; and these old ladies know all the children, and they call on the masters and mistresses, and keep an eye on the children.

1027. You do not think that that sort of supervision would be any obstacle to the girl getting an engagement?

No; if it is done with tact; but if it were done by the relieving officer there would be a risk.

1028. That would be a case where some arrangement with a charitable organisation would be desirable?

Very desirable.
1028. You were mentioning the severe measures taken in Germany against people who cannot prove that they have made efforts to get work. To some extent there is something analogous to that in England: that the man who is offered work and refuses it may be brought before the magistrates as a rogue and vagabond.

Yes; and if he does it again and again he may be flogged.

1029. And, to a certain extent, that law might be put into operation more often; not the flogging, I mean, but the calling upon the man to accept work, and if not, taking him before the magistrates?

That might get us into trade difficulties, and the question of what was all adequate remuneration.

1030. On the whole, you think it would not be easy to make that at an of general application?

On the whole, I would rather leave it alone.

1031. I will ask you one or two questions with regard to your very interesting report. I gather from it that you do not see your way to the introduction into our system of anything resembling the Elberfeld system?

I think there is a great deal to be learned from it, but I do not think there is the least chance of our successfully substituting for paid relieving officers voluntary workers.

1032. In Germany they are not voluntary workers; they are voluntary workers in one sense, but they are compelled to accept the office?

They are compelled to accept the office.

1033. In order that the charitable association should act at all efficiently in connection with Poor Law administration, would it not be necessary that they should have a considerable number of well-chosen voluntary workers?

I think so. I think one great difficulty of any organised connection between the Poor Law and the charitable association is the defective administration of the Charity Organisation Societies themselves. In some cases they have simply dropped into mere dole societies, and give money like anybody else, without inquiries.

1034. In order that they should act efficiently, they require to have some active and energetic people acting as inquiry officers and distributing the relief, people who could really be trusted?

I think that would be necessary before the guardians could rely upon them as a subsidiary help.

1035. If such an organisation existed you would see the desirability of joint working with the guardians?

Yes, certainly, and promote it.

1036. Lord Thring. What do you think of giving the Charity Organisation Societies some legal power to make contracts with the guardians, binding on both parties?

My first view is not favourable to that.

1037. Chairman. You probably have studied somewhat the operation of charitable associations in this country; but beneficent as their aims are, in your judgment do you not think that very often they do a great deal of harm?

An immense amount of mischief.

1038. And it is one of the principal difficulties connected with the administration of the existing Poor Law system, that it is crossed by charitable associations, very often ill-directed?

Yes; but I think that is the guardians own fault. I mean that I have known a charitable association pride itself on giving money on the distinct understanding that that money given by charity should not be taken into consideration by the board of guardians in fixing the amount of relief given. Of course, that is a grotesque misapprehension of the object of the Poor Law;
the guardians are bound to take into account every penny a man gets from any source, even (as I have heard it quaintly put) if it be manna from Heaven.

1039. Lord Thring.] What would be the objection to allowing an agreement to be made that the Poor Law should give half and the charitable association half, or something of that sort?

The object of the association of the charity and the Poor Law would be not to jointly bear the burden, but to hand over the hard cases, or the cases that might be helped by a gift, to the charity; and the mixing up of the charity and the Poor Law would tend, I believe, to weaken both. People would not give to the charity, because they would say it was simply giving to the rates, and people would administer the Poor Law badly, because they would say they could fall back on the charity.

1040. Supposing I belonged to a charitable society, and I said, "I will give that man 2 s. 6 d. a week if the guardians will supply the residue," how would that work?

I think that would be a very bad arrangement.

1041. Chairman.] As a matter of practice it would be almost impossible for the guardians to take into consideration what is given in pure voluntary charity in fixing the relief, would it not?

It is very difficult, because the charity is very often given as one gift and not as an allowance.

1042. If it were given as a regular allowance, they can, and ought, to take cognisance of it?

So I think.

1043. But if it is given as intermittent and occasional charity, would it not be almost impossible for the board of guardians to take notice of it?

With the present system of supervision by relieving officers, it would be impossible; they would never find it out.

1044. There is this further difficulty in the case of out-door relief: assuming that out-door relief ought to be given in the particular case, there are certain comforts which you could hardly supply probably to a sick person from the poor-rates, and yet which a charitable person might supply; do you think there would be an objection in principle to taking these into consideration?

You can hardly cut these things with an axe; you do not make a man less destitute when he is sick and you give him some jelly or some port wine.

1045. But what is really wanted, I apprehend in your opinion is, that cases where it would be desirable, from a charitable point of view, that there should be full relief given, but it would infringe upon sound principles to give that relief from the rates, should be dealt with by private charity, and if not dealt with by individuals, there should be a means of putting those cases before some charitable organization that might take charge of them?

Yes, quite so, in cases where a man should be helped by the grant of one lump sum.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.
The Earl of Kimberley, in the Chair.

Mr. John Jones, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

1046. Chairman.] You are Relieving Officer of the Stepney Union?
I am.

1047. How long have you held that office?
Since February 1869.

1048. According to a return which I have before me, the Stepney Union had a population of 158,543 in 1881; the number of in-door paupers relieved on the 1st of July 1887 was 907, being in the ratio of 15·5 per 1,000 of the population; and the number of out-door paupers, 209, being in the ratio of 3·6 per 1,000 of the population; the total number relieved being 1,116, being in the ratio of 19·1 per 1,000 of the population. Are those figures correct?
They are.

1049. Can you give us any figures showing what has been the amount of pauperism in previous years in Stepney?
I cannot.

1050. May I assume that there has been a very large reduction in the out-door pauperism?
Very large indeed. Before 1866 and 1868 say 1864 the normal condition was that, about 1,500 were relieved in a week, but now only about 26.

1051. At that time was the in-door pauperism more or less than it is now?
About the same.

1052. Has there been a large increase in the number of in-door paupers?
No.

1053. At present is the tendency to increase or to decrease?
It is just at a stand, I think. In 1888, in the first week of April we had 1,056; in 1887, in the first week in April we had 1,094. Therefore in the last year we have decreased.

1054. I find, in a Paper which you have sent to the Committee, that the number of in-door poor in 1869 was 1,708, and that in 1887 it was 1,670; That is so.
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1055. And
30th April 1888.]

Mr. Jones.

[Continued.

1055. And the half-yearly cost of in-door maintenance has fallen in the same years from 6,344 l. to 5,389 l., has it not?

The cost of maintenance, of course, would depend very much upon the price of food, but it has fallen considerably.

1056. On the other hand, the number of persons receiving out-door relief has fallen, according to this return, from 7,602 in 1869 to 95 in 1887?

That is so, for the corresponding half of each years.

1057. But that does not include those who received out-door relief in the shape of medical assistance only?

It does not.

1058. And they would be counted in the Local Government Board Return?

I presume so.

1059. Therefore they must be added; so that the total number of persons receiving out-door relief is 1,150 in 1887, as compared with 10,022 in 1869?

That is so.

1060. Will you explain what are the rules under which the guardians act, as regards the granting of out-door relief; I mean their own rules, not the order of the Poor Law Board?

They have fixed practices; they have not rules drawn up.

1061. Can you tell us what their established practice is with regard to out-door relief?

They take into the district school the children of widows, leaving with the widow as many children as she may be able to support comfortably. Supposing a widow to be left with six children, and that none of them are able to work, the guardians would probably take four, leaving her with two.

1062. Supposing that an able-bodied widow, in good work, with five children, applied for out-door relief, and that on investigation she was found to be really destitute in the technical sense of the term, namely, that the guardians were of opinion that she was entitled to relief, what would be their ordinary course of proceeding in such a case?

The first proceeding would be to inquire into her circumstances, her character, her surroundings, and her ability to maintain one or more children; and having come to the conclusion that she could support two children, they would offer admission to the other three in the schools, supposing that neither of them could do any work.

1063. Supposing that the widow declined that offer, what would be done then?

The guardians would refer her back to reconsider her decision.

1064. If she adhered to her decision, what would the guardians do?

They would not assist her.

1065. Do you mean that they would not give her an order for the house?

They would.

1066. They would then offer her, as an alternative, an order for the house?

That would be so, although I have never known any necessity for doing so, except in one case.

1067. Do widows, as a rule, very willingly part with the children whom the guardians desire to remove from their mother's care?

When the principle was first adopted by the guardians there was some little clamour by the widows, and objections were raised; but finding that the guardians were firm in their decisions the widows gave way; and subsequently it became so patent to them all that it was the best for their children, that we have no need to offer them the house, because they come to us to ask to have their children taken in.

1068. To what establishments are those children sent?

Our union is connected with the South Metropolitan District Schools at Sutton.

1069. Are
1069. Are those large establishments?
They are; there are three establishments there.

1070. Lord Thring.] Are the children clothed and maintained entirely at
those schools?
They are maintained entirely; they have all the necessaries of life, clothing,
&c.

1071. Chairman.] The guardians are, I presume, strict as to not taking
the children of a widow, if the widow can support them herself in her own home?
Yes.

1072. How many children do they generally assume that an able-bodied
widow can support?
It would depend upon the calling of the widow. Some can support three,
some two, and some only one. After due inquiry into the abilities of the
widow the guardians judge as to the number of children of whom they will
relieve her.

1073. Supposing that the widow at any time wished to remove one of those
children from the district schools on the ground that she can now support it,
would the guardians allow her to remove one, or would they insist that she
should remove all?
She might have one or more, as she required. In order that we may be sure
as to the altered circumstances of the widows they have to report themselves at
the relief office once in a month. The relieving officer has to keep a record of
his visits to the home of the widow once a month, so that they are not lost
sight of when the children are taken into the schools, and their circumstances
are reported to the guardians once in six months. The widows themselves
come up for revision. The widow has to come to the relieving officer and
report herself as to where she is living, and there is a record made in a book
by the relieving officer, not an authorised book. Then the officer is also
required, within a month, to visit the home of the widow, and make a record,
not in an authorised book. Unless he finds any alteration or change of cir-
cumstances he is only supposed to report these cases to the guardians once in
six months, when they are brought up for revision. The guardians have the
whole of the widows before them once in six months, and if they see it is
necessary they request one child or more to be taken out; if not, they remain
as before.

1074. Is effect the relief given is relief to the widow?
It is.

1075. And therefore the widow is required, of course, to keep herself in com-
unication with the guardians?
Yes, just as if she were in receipt of out-door relief.

1076. Have you found that this system has largely reduced the number of
widows applying for relief?
No widow applies for relief now, unless she is recently imported into the union,
without applying for the in-door relief for her children.

1077. But apart from that, do you think the result has been to diminish the
number of applications?
Very much so indeed.

1078. At present, I think I understood you to say, there is not any general
complaint of this practice as a hardship to the poor?
None whatever; I have not heard a single complaint for years.

1079. What is the course pursued in the case of able-bodied men who apply
for relief; first, through sickness of family?
If the head of the family applies through sickness, and the sickness is not of
so very temporary a character as to be only for a day or two, but is likely to
last a fortnight, then the man is offered admission to the sick asylum. If he
accepts (and we find very few indeed, not one in a hundred, would refuse to do
(70.)
so), the family are provided for. I may say that the guardians have not found it necessary to do so themselves, because if the character of the family be good they have been assisted by charity for some years past.

1080. If the character of the family be bad, and they cannot obtain charity, what is done? Then the guardians offer to take some of the children into the house during the interval in which the husband, or the father, is in the sick asylum.

1081. What would be done with regard to the wife? If she be a bad character, and she wants relief, we offer her the workhouse.

1082. Now will you take the case of men who apply through want of work? The men who have applied through want of work for a very long period, since 1872 or 1873, have been offered admission for themselves to the workhouse. That is the in-door test for the men.

1083. Including their families? No, the men alone. If the man accepts that offer, unless, as I say again, the wife is of very bad character, the home is not broken up by offering admission to the wife at all, but she is cared for by out-door relief. We have for eight or ten years been able to do that through charity. But if a man has accepted the offer of the workhouse, and his wife be of bad character, we then offer to take in so many children as the woman will part with, and they remain whilst the husband is inside the workhouse.

1084. And I suppose the wife also, if she is destitute? If she be destitute and of bad character she has the workhouse offered to her; but if she be of good character, and the home and the surroundings be comfortable, then she is relieved. If charity did not do so the guardians would relieve her.

1085. What course is pursued with regard to women with illegitimate children? The workhouse is always offered to them. No out-door relief is given to them.

1086. Without exception? I have one exception in my mind; that is the case of a woman who had cohabited with a man as his wife for 14 years, and he died. She was a very respectable woman apart from that misfortune; and the guardians took in one of the children. That is the only case of illegitimacy that I know in which the rule has been departed from.

1087. You have no labour-yards, I understand? We have not had them for many years.

1088. Are you subject, in Stepney, to any considerable number of people being thrown out of work in the winter? We have dock labourers, and we have bricklayers, and various callings of that sort, who sometimes are thrown out of work.

1089. Are many of them thrown out of work at a time? In the case of the dock labourers a very large number may be out of work at a time, but they can get casual days' work, perhaps three days a week, and the next week they may get more, and the next week less; but they are never entirely out of employment for a long period.

1090. Are those men who get two or three days' work a week able to support themselves upon such wages as they get in that way? Truly it is difficult to say how they support themselves; but, together with what they get from the earnings of their wives and their children, and so on, they carry on an existence.

1091. As a matter of fact, they manage to carry on an existence in that case without applying to the guardians? They do. It was not so when we had the labour-yards open.

1092. When
1092. When you had the labour-yard open, did men of that kind generally have recourse to it?

Men of that kind looked upon it as a place to come to pass their time at when they had nothing else to do, simply to sit down and pick oakum, &c. I know from my experience that many of them did come there, after having been at work nearly all night, and sat down in the yard afterwards and picked oakum. We have oakum-picking and wood-chopping. There was a great deal of corruption undoubtedly among the people when the labour-yard was opened, and it had a most injurious effect upon the people. I took at the time some trouble to ascertain something about their characteristics.

1093. When was the labour-yard dis-continued.

In 1872. I have myself heard the dock labourers, on more than one occasion, sitting down at their work, and calculating among themselves how much each would have for his day's work. They have five days in the week. If they take five days at so much it is far better for them to sit there doing that than to take the chance of going to the docks where perhaps they would only get three days' work; so that they were content to sit in that yard and pick oakum for a few hours in the day rather than go and use their efforts to find work. I found also that the same men came year after year at the same periods. I found that they were totally discouraged as to any efforts to care for themselves or to be thrifty. I found also that they regarded it as a right, and it created a chronic necessity. It also tended to keep a number of people congested together who were satisfied to work during times of labour being plentiful, knowing that they could be helped through the winter during times of slackness; it had that effect on their minds. Besides, it had this effect: A man would work four or five days in the week, and not having found work by nine or ten o'clock on the sixth day, he would come and sit down and make it a sort of relief in aid of wages to himself. I have found men who worked by night on the river as watermen, who did not care to remain in bed all day, but would come up and sit down in the labour-yard during the day and do that work. The work, of course, was not laborious. Then I also found that those men who were so careless as to look upon the yard as their right, did very badly with the money and the bread which were given to them.

At my own expense, I employed three or four men for weeks together for the purpose of watching the action of these men when they left the labour-yards. It has been known that the men have gone direct from the labour-yard to some place and sold their bread, and taken the money which they have got for the bread to the public-house. When this report was brought to me against people, I visited the wives to find out whether the men had brought home any of the money which I had given to them. In some instances I found that the man had given his family a little, perhaps 1 s. or 2 s., or perhaps less than that; the rest he had made use of himself. We closed the labour-yard and offered the house to every man, and not one single one accepted it, although some of them had been said to have been out of work for over six or eight months. Therefore we came to this alternative, to offer the labour-yard of the workhouse. We do not get one in 50 that accepts that test. From my personal observation and knowledge of the cases, I am able to say that they are just as well off without the assistance which they would get from the parish as they were when they used to have it. In January 1881 about 100 people went to the Thames Police Court, knowing that funds were in the hands of the magistrate to be given away. It appears that the funds had got low, or the magistrate had found out that what he was doing was not the right thing. He told them that if they wanted relief they must go to the relieving officers; and about 50 of them at once marched in a drove down to the relief office, where I was. Of course we were taken by surprise; but we did the best we could in taking down their applications, and I addressed them and told them what was the practice of the guardians; that if any of them would accept the offer of the workhouse for himself, I would undertake that his family should be provided for whilst he was there; if they would not do so they must take their chance. Out of that number of, I should think about 50, we had four who accepted that test. I procured from the Charity Organisation Society sufficient funds to (70.)
maintain each family for a week. I carried the money and the tickets to them myself, so that I was sure they had it. Not one of the men remained in the house three days; therefore, the relief was discontinued and they were satisfied to go on as before. This makes me think that there might be a relaxation of the relief order test, that is to say, for the labour-yard. In this case, had not charity stepped in to have assisted I should have administered relief from the Poor Law sources, although I believe there is some doubt as to whether it is legal; but I should have done it under the circumstances; and I think that the Local Government Board might initiate a reform in the direction of allowing the guardians to offer the test of the workhouse to the men instead of sending them to the labour-yard, and that where they cannot procure charity they may pay the relief to the family out of the poor rates. It would be a fair test to the men without the corruptions which attend the labour-yard. It would also be the way to administer relief without breaking up the home of the family, and it would withdraw the men from the labour market for the time.

1094. Would you not be afraid that if that practice was generally introduced, and the men knew that their families would be provided for, there might be rather a greater disposition on the part of the men to go into the workhouse when they might maintain themselves outside?

Of course all these things must be done under inquiry. If you are satisfied that there is no chance of the man getting work, and he himself is satisfied that there is no chance of his getting work, he will go into the workhouse; but if he is not satisfied that there is no chance of his getting work, he will stand the chance of getting it rather than accept the test. I do not think that it is at all likely to bring men to make application for relief, when they would not do it otherwise. If a man, the head of a family, applies for relief, one gives him the order; but he is not bound to take his family inside with him. The master is bound to receive him if he presents himself without his wife or children. Then if the wife and children be left outside and become destitute of course we could offer the workhouse; but if we found them so destitute that it was a case of urgent necessity, we must still relieve them. Therefore what I want to get legalised is that the guardians should be empowered to give relief in this form if they find it absolutely necessary to do so.

1095. At present those cases are dealt with by means of charitable assistance?

They are.

1096. If you relieved the families out of the rates would not that dry up the springs of charity?

It would; but there are places where perhaps charity may not be sod; I am speaking of cases where the cooperation of charity cannot be found in the way that it has been found in Stepney.

1097. If the practice that you recommend were generally adopted, would it not probably have the effect of so far damping the efforts of charitable persons that you would find that the Poor Law will be substituted for charity?

I fear that it would have that tendency; I think it is possible.

1098. The knowledge that families would have to go into the workhouse, and that it would be for charitable reasons desirable in some cases, or perhaps in not a few cases, that they should not go into the workhouse, may have a considerable effect on the minds of persons in inducing them to organise charity?

Yes; I quite agree that it would.

1099. After the evidence that you have given I need hardly ask you whether you may not infer that you are strongly against the establishment of labour-yards?

I am; their evils are very great indeed.

1100. Will you explain what course is pursued with regard to the aged and infirm poor?

The cases of persons of the aged class who make an application to the relieving officer are taken down in a peculiar form, not on the application and report book at first. The guardians have what is called a Record Book; it is very
very similar to the case paper of the Charity Organisation Society. Our duty
as relieving officers is, having taken the case down with all its details and family
connections, &c., to consider whether it is a case for out-door relief. If from
our inquiries we find that it is so, the applicant is told that the guardians do not
at present give, and have not for a long time given, out-door relief to aged
people; but at the same time a letter is given to that person addressed to the
Charity Organisation Society, or the secretary, setting forth what the relieving
officer knows about him, and asking them to consider the case. If the appli-
cant will not do that, he, or she, is taken before the guardians; and I have not
known, since 1877, one person but what has been referred in that way to the
Charity Organisation Society, and out-door permanent relief has not been given
to any old person since 1877 by the guardians. If the Charity Organisation
Society, after making strict inquiries, are satisfied that it is their duty to step in
to assist rather than to let the severity of the law be felt, they give that person
out-door relief, which is charity. I have not found one case for several years that
has come from the Charity Organisation Committee in which the guardians
have been dissatisfied with their decisions. The guardians consider that an old
person should have at the least 1 s. a day from all sources to live on.

1101. Does that apply also to the infirm poor?
To all permanent classes.

1102. Do your guardians habitually take steps to require the relations of
paupers who are liable for their support to contribute to their support, or to
support them entirely.
They do. I am for my district the prosecuting officer, and my duty is to find
out such members of the family as are legally bound and are able to support
their relations, and to report those persons to the guardians. The order is
made that an application should be made to them for what amount the guardians
may fix on.

1103. Do you find that you succeed in many cases in compelling the relations
to support paupers.
I do. But their moral sense is first of all appealed to, and if they refuse to
comply with the request of the guardians then legal proceedings are taken.

1104. Is it not compulsory under the Poor Law first to give the person an
opportunity of complying without legal compulsion, and subsequently to that
proceedings may be taken?
It is common sense to do so, at all events.

1105. Do you sometimes accept from the relations a portion of the cost of
the support of the pauper?
We accept what we think the man ought to contribute; it may be a portion
or it may be the whole.

1106. How small a sum do you ever enforce?
I have never known less than a shilling a week enforced.

1107. You have given us some very interesting information about the opera-
tions of charitable societies in your union, and it appears from that information
that the societies are in constant communication with the Poor Law authorities;
can you explain to us more particularly the system which prevails of communi-
cation between your Poor Law authorities and the charitable organisations in
your district.
In the first place, the Stepney Union began the reform without the assistance
of charity. They commenced it, and carried it on for some three or four years,
when charitable organisations, finding the wise administration that was being car-
rried on by the Poor Law, offered their assistance. That has been going on now
for about 12 years, mitigating some of the rigours of the Poor Law. We
have now the vice-chairman of our board a member of the Charity Organisation
Committee; we have one of the honorary secretaries of the society a nomi-
nated member on the board of guardians; therefore there is a close inter-
communication between the guardians and the committee itself.

(70.)

1108. Are
1108. Are you speaking of the Charity Organisation Society for London.

I am; it is a committee or branch for Stepney. As relieving officer I have myself been a member of that committee for about 14 years; therefore I have had opportunities of expressing my views with regard to some of the cases which have been sent there by the guardians, and in some instances, perhaps, directing the channel of thought for or against. But apart from that, our instructions from the guardians are, that if we find cases in which, having regard to the character and surroundings of the people, and so on, they would really be demoralised by admission to the workhouse, our duty is to tell them in the first instance that the guardians do not give the kind of relief which they ask, and to forward them on to the Charity Organisation Society, and to await the result, reporting to the guardians what we have done in our application and report book that week. It is reported that that case has been before us, and that we have forwarded it to the Charity Organisation Society. The chairman usually writes down, "Report again in two weeks the result." That is done. So that there is also this close communication between the committee of the Charity Organisation Society and the guardians, besides the way which I have explained before.

1109. As I gather, the assistance of the Charity Organisation Society is confined to deserving cases?

It is. Then the Charity Organisation Society has also connected with it the whole of the charities in the Stepney Union. The clergymen and others, the almoners for the Society for the Relief of Distress, all those are members of the committee. Then as relieving officers we have to put ourselves in communication with the clergy of the district respecting cases which apply to us in any clergyman's district.

1110. Have you ever heard such an objection as this raised to that system, that by so enforcing the Poor Law that this class of cases are relieved by charity and not by the Poor Law, you are throwing on a portion only of the inhabitants of Stepney the cost of relieving the poor which ought to be borne by the whole?

I have never heard that remarked, but I have always felt that there was a brotherhood existing between man and man, and that it was the duty of the law to deal with destitution and destitution only.

1111. Earl of Onslow.] Are the Committee to understand that the funds of the Charity Organisation Committee come from the inhabitants of Stepney only?

No.

1112. I wanted to know whether you had ever heard the objection started that those ratepayers who did not contribute to charitable organisations were in fact relieved at the expense of those who did, whether in Stepney or elsewhere?

I have not.

1113. Have you many casual poor in your union?

I think I am right in saying that we have not had a casual ward for 10 years.

1114. How do you deal with the casual poor?

If a casual poor person should come to me wanting admission to the workhouse, I should give it to him after some inquiries; but if he wanted a night's lodging I should refer him to the nearest casual ward. The relieving officers have no power to admit a person to the casual ward.

1115. You have no casual ward, as I understand?

We have not at present.

1116. Therefore, in point of fact, if you gave admission to a man you must give him admission to the workhouse?

Yes, I must treat him as a localised poor person.

1117. Are all vagrants or casual poor (the terms being the same) dealt with in what you speak of as the nearest casual ward?

No.
No. There is a place opened in my district where respectable casuals, as they are called, are taken in and kept for a week at the expense of charity.

1118. Supposing that they are disreputable characters, do they take them in? Then the applications are not entertained.

1119. Where are they cared for?

If they go to the casual ward they are admitted as casuals.

1120. But is this a charitable casual ward of which you speak?

The one which I have spoken of where they are kept for a week is a charitable casual ward.

1121. I understood you to say that you had no casual ward at all?

We have not a casual ward attached to the union.

1122. Where is a disreputable casual applicant dealt with?

If he came to me and said that he wanted a night's lodging in the casual ward, I should have to direct him to the nearest casual ward. If he wanted admission to the workhouse it is my duty to deal with him.

1123. Confining myself to those who are, strictly speaking, casuals, these disreputable persons would be dealt with, I understand, in the nearest casual ward?

In the nearest casual ward.

1124. But you say that there are no casual wards?

There are no casual wards attached to our union. At Mile End and at Whitechapel there are casual wards.

1125. Do you mean that you send off your casual poor to another union?

They are not our casual poor. A vagrant or casual person passing through our union on his way elsewhere becoming destitute and in want of a night's lodging, would not be considered one of our poor.

1126. Do you mean to say that you have the practice of passing on your casual poor upon other unions?

I do not think that that would be considered passing them on. Assuming a person coming from Whitechapel having passed through St. George's and coming into my district, he is not one of our casual poor. He might have come, for aught I know, from the north of England. He comes to me as the relieving officer and he wants a night's lodging. That I have no power to give him, but I can offer to take him into the workhouse if he is destitute. If he merely wants a night's lodging as a wayfarer he has to find the nearest casual ward.

1127. But why are you in your union to be relieved of the expense of providing for the wayfarers in your union?

We had a casual ward open for a number of years.

1128. But can you answer my question, because, as I have always understood, one of the principles of the Poor Law is that a wayfarer is to be provided for in the union through which he is passing. How comes it that you have been allowed to introduce a practice by which you cast the duty of providing for wayfarers upon other unions?

It was allowed by the Local Government Board.

1129. Was there a correspondence with the Local Government Board upon the subject?

There was; I think I shall satisfy your Lordships that there was no real necessity for the casual ward. In 1869, when I first came to London, we used to get from 40 to 50 men a night sleeping in the casual wards around my office. My office was a part of the casual ward, and I had then many opportunities of seeing and watching the characters of the persons who came there. That went on for some years, and in 1871 I wrote something about them. But I will only trouble your Lordships with this: In five of those East-end casual wards, from the 29th of September 1870 to 3rd of March 1871, 495 of these so-called wayfarers were sent to prison; 133 of them were sent for periods ranging from seven
seven days to a month for tearing up their clothes; 53 for from 14 days to a month for refusing to work; and 309 for from five days to a month for neglecting to work. That was the character of the class of persons who used to come to the casual wards at that time. Subsequently, by a change in the legal method of admitting to the casual wards, it fell on the relieving officers for a short period to admit them to the casual wards. For that purpose the guardians appointed me and gave me 20 l. a year. It would have been to my interest to have kept that 20 l. a year; but seeing the character of the persons who came, I adopted the same course in dealing with them as I do in dealing with all applicants. I went into full particulars of their cases, and from experience I could easily detect the bond fide wayfarer from the tramp or professional beggar. I do not know whether I exceeded any duty, but I mentioned it to the inspectors subsequently, and instead of giving the professional beggar an order for the casual ward, I gave him an order for the workhouse. If I had a bond fide wayfarer I gave him an order for the casual ward, and I allowed that man to leave in the morning in time to go in search of work. The result was that in less than six months, instead of having, as we had before, from 40 to 50 men, and a number of women, but not so many, I did not get three in a night until the number was so reduced that we did not get six in a week, and then it was that the Local Government Board closed the casual ward.

1130. Lord Balfour.] Is it the fact that the metropolitan casual wards are charged on the metropolitan common fund?

It is.

1131. Therefore, it does not matter where the local situation of the casual ward is; it is still charged on the whole area?

It does not make the slightest difference to the union.

1132. Chairman.] Do I correctly understand that you would recommend that there should be no distinction drawn as a rule between casual paupers, as they are termed, and other paupers, but that all should receive an order for the house if it is proper that they should receive relief?

That is my opinion. It is based upon experience in the country, as well as upon experience in London.

1133. In the case of the genuine wayfarer, it would be necessary to allow him to proceed on his way after one night, would it not?

There should be some regulation whereby such a man should not be detained.

1134. If such a practice were introduced, do you think it would be possible to leave such a discretion with the master of the workhouse that, in cases where he was satisfied that a man was a wayfarer, he should allow him to depart from the workhouse after one night.

I should be very sorry to say of any master that he was not a proper person to do so. If he was not a proper person to have such powers, I think he would not be fit to be a master.

1135. Have you often removals of paupers who are not settled from your union to other places of settlement?

That is often done.

1136. Have you formed any opinion of the working of the law of settlement?

I think that, so far as the metropolis itself is concerned, the law of settlement should be abolished. It is quite useless passing a man from Stepney to St. George's, or from St. George's to Whitechapel.

1137. Would you apply that to the whole country?

No; I think, so far as the country is concerned, there are persons who come to London expecting, as is often said, to find money in the streets, and who, if they become chargeable, ought to be sent back to the place from which they came.

1138. How many relieving officers have you in the Stepney Union?

Two, with two assistants.
Is there anything else that you wish to state upon this part of this subject?

It has been said that the Poor Law could do this work altogether without charity, and that the powers of the Poor Law will meet all ordinary cases of poverty. Some people say that the Poor Law could have done the same kind of work in Stepney without charity as is done with the assistance of charity; now I do not agree with that. Charity has much work to do that the Poor Law cannot do; besides, to carry on the investigations as they are carried on by charity, as we have attempted to do in the Stepney Union, the staff of officials would have to be greatly increased. We should have to prove, as the Charity Organisation Society have to do, whether the apparent destitution is real or not; we should have to trace the causes, and we should have to obtain authentic information as to character. I hope if there be any gentleman here from the Poor Law Board that they will only accept this as my opinion, and not regard it as an attempt to introduce it as an innovation; but I say that the Poor Law system wants an authorised machinery for recording facts and cases; it wants an inter-communication between the officers of the different unions which does not now exist. If I wanted any information as to the character of a person who had come from a neighbouring union, I should write, perhaps, to the relieving officer, and he might put my letter in his drawer, according to his ideas upon the question; he is not compelled to furnish me with any information. Then there is no means of handing down the experience of an officer of twenty years standing to any person who may succeed him. The knowledge that I have with regard to the poor, if there were not any books, would be carried away on my leaving the union. The officer who would succeed me would know nothing of the people whom I know all about; therefore, I would suggest that whatever reforms take place, there should be something like an examination into the working of the present system of inter-communication and recording facts, &c. I am sure that the Poor Law itself is so constituted, and the rules and regulations are so elastic, that it is competent to deal entirely with the destitution of the poor but not to raise them out of their pauperised condition; therefore, it is far better that it should do it in connection with charity. Given a body of gentlemen fully conversant with the Poor Law, with fixed principles for carrying out the strict administration required to fulfil the conditions of legal relief, with a staff of officers, and they can do all the work. But there is all the difference between Poor Law relief and charitable relief. The person who applies for Poor Law relief applies with a legal right to demand it; the person who applies for charity applies and obtains it somewhat as a favour, and is thankful for it. There is also a great difference in the givers; and that is the great distinction between Poor Law relief and charity. The legal officer has a simple duty to perform; he does it, and when he has done it he is only regarded as an official. But the almoner of a charity does it for the love of it, and he carries more than money, he carries with him a personal friendship. That friendship is created between the rich and the poor, and it develops family ties. It may be that I have transgressed the bounds of what your Lordships require of me in what I have said; but these are my views, based upon experience that the Poor Law itself is competent to do what is required of it if we have the right administrators; but, at the same time, I feel strongly that the Poor Law should be worked in close cooperation with organised charity.

Chairman. In your printed paper it is stated that during the last year the Charity Organisation Committee collected and expended 1,345 l. 9 s. 10 d. for relief; that of this sum, 740 l. went in pensions for aged folk; that other forms of assistance were: loans in 16 cases; gifts in money, 331 cases; food, 24 cases; clothing, 68 cases; hospital treatment, 35 cases; convalescent treatment, 64 cases; surgical appliances, 24 cases; general help, 30 cases; employment found, 17 cases; emigration, 20 cases; tools, 12 cases; stock, 14 cases; that in all the applications numbered 816, and that of these 502 received substantial help from some charity or private individual. Is that so?

That is so.

Earl of Aberdeen. Have you two relieving officers under your superintendence?

No.
No, I am relieving officer of my district, which is about two-thirds of the union, and I have an assistant. There is another relieving officer who is independent of me, who has a district also.

1142. In another part of Stepney?
In another part of the district of Stepney.

1143. If I were an inhabitant of Stepney and found myself destitute, what would be the proper steps for me to take to get relief?
To apply to a relieving officer. We are at our offices from half-past nine o'clock to half-past five o'clock; someone is always present between those hours. Our addresses are given to all the policemen, and they will be found at the relief offices supposing that a case of necessity arises after the hours which I have named.

1144. When a man comes to you for relief, you would, as a rule, offer him admission to the house, I presume?
I should, as a rule; but not without some knowledge of the case, not without making some inquiries, unless it was a casual.

1145. Supposing you found that he was a man who ought to be admitted to the house, but was in your opinion not in any sense a disreputable person, would it be in your power to specially recommend the master of the workhouse, as far as possible to prevent his being placed with the disreputable people?
No, I have nothing whatever to do with classification.

1146. Are you aware of the practice in that respect as to the extent to which classification is adopted?
I am unable to answer that question.

1147. Among the people whom you refer to the house there is a very wide distinction, I presume, as to their respectability, or want of respectability?
There would be if no out-relief were given at all; but since out-relief is given in the form of charity there is not that great distinction.

1148. The suggestion that there should be assistance from voluntary sources came, I think you said, first from charitable societies?
It did.

1149. Do you know what it was that led them to make that suggestion?
Seeing that the Stepney Guardians were approaching a strict administration of the Poor Law, and being myself a member of the committee, I suggested the lines upon which they could step in and assist the Poor Law to carry it further for the purpose of strict administration.

1150. It was, in fact, to prevent cases of great hardship occurring owing to increased strictness of administration?
The guardians would not have discontinued out-door relief to the old and respectable people, if the Charity Organisation Society had not taken it up.

1151. Would it not be possible to restrict the charitable voluntary relief to cases which for one reason or another the Poor Law guardians could not, in accordance with the regulations, properly relieve?
It would be a very narrow restriction.

1152. If something of that sort were carried out it would take away any ground of complaint, would it not, that the rates were being relieved by the contributions made by a few persons in the form of charity?
I do not think that it could. A person desirous of giving to the poor cannot grumble because in giving to them he relieves the rates.

1153. I should agree with that view myself, but we have had reference made to the complaints of that system which may be raised; I understand, however, that you have not had any such complaints under your personal notice?
I could not have myself suggested the idea that such things would be said.

1154. In connection with this system of charitable relief, you mention in your pamphlet that particular inquiry is instituted as to the character of the persons who
who apply for relief, and especially as to whether they have made reasonable provision against sickness and old age; supposing that the character of such a person is not altogether satisfactory, and that he has not made reasonable provision, what becomes of him then?

Then it becomes a case for the Poor Law, and he would be offered admission to the workhouse.

1155. Does the Society for the Relief of Distress carry on considerable operations in your district?

It has its almoners in every church district, and each almoner is connected with the Charity Organization Committee.

1156. They work in harmony?

Yes.

1157. You mentioned, did you not, that the vast majority of the men who had been in the labour yard refused the workhouse when offered?

Not one of them accepted it.

1158. Does not that point to the fact that while there is a large number of people who are very willing to accept relief other than the house, the bond fide working man, even if reduced to great straits, will avoid it?

There are men of sufficient character and independence to refuse or reject any kind of relief until the last extremity comes; to such a man, if I knew him, I should be the last to offer the workhouse. But regarding the general body of persons who come to the labour yard from time to time, I do not think there is any hardship at all in offering them the workhouse. That is the best that could be offered them; although they were working at almost starvation money they were satisfied to come and stay there from day to day rather than seek for work.

1159. How do you account for the fact that men of a different class out of employment did not resort to the labour yard?

I suppose they manage by combination and by assistance from poor to poor to get on in the world.

1160. Do you observe any growth of a feeling amongst respectable members of the working classes that even out-door relief is in a sense derogatory?

I do. That feeling has grown very much since our system has been in practice in the East-end of London.

1161. You have endeavoured to foster that feeling in every way?

Yes. I might say also that when we first commenced our system we could get no information from the poor themselves, or even from the little tradesmen as to the character and doings of the people, because each of them expected in their turn to reap the same benefits. But when we broke in amongst their ranks and found out the undeserving and treated them as the guardians did, then we could get information from various sources that had been closed to us before, showing that these people were all in collusion.

1162. You include small tradesmen in that category?

I do.

1163. Reverting to the system as to the casuals, you mentioned, I think, that respectable wayfarers are placed in a house of refuge supported by voluntary contributions where they stop for a week.

Yes, and sometimes longer, according to the wish of the person who admits them.

1164. Would there be any objection to having a similar house supported by the rates where persons could be received, not for a week but for a night?

I think there would be great objection to that. The one would be demanded as a right, and the other as a favour. The one would come in when he likes and go when he thinks proper.

1165. Your figures show that the class of persons who resort to casual wards are usually tramps and disreputable people?

That is my experience.

(70.)

1166. Does
1166. Does not that make it important that a genuine wayfarer in search of work should have a chance of accommodation which would not class him with persons of the other description.

If a wayfarer passing through London went to the casual ward, there being no casual ward but the workhouse, I agree that that man should be treated apart from the casuals and should be allowed to go on his journey the next morning as soon as possible.

1167. As a matter of fact, he has to go with the tramps, who may be very disreputable characters, and do his work with them, I suppose?

Yes.

1168. I did not quite understand your answer to my recent question as to whether there could be a house of refuge supported by the rates. It would be right, no doubt, but it would be no more a right than admission to the casual ward, only that the accommodation and the task might be of a slightly different character.

I fear that in that case you would find that a large number of local single men would be applying for lodgings who would not be wayfarers at all. I omitted, I think, to state my experience at casual wards. I found that a large percentage of those persons applying at various times were persons belonging to the immediate neighbourhood, and were not casual wayfarers at all.

1169. Therefore, you would have had no difficulty in refusing them admission to such a house of refuge as I suggest, and in referring them to the workhouse?

No.

1170. Your knowledge would have enabled you to discriminate?

It might do so.

1171. When you refer a tramp at Stepney to the workhouse instead of the casual ward, I presume that he has a similar task to that which he would have in the casual ward?

He is treated as an ordinary inmate of the workhouse.

1172. Is that treatment less severe than the treatment at the casual ward?

I cannot say.

1173. The tramp whom you refer to the workhouse would in this respect be in a different position as compared with the casual ward: that he would not be in a cell?

No, he would be sent into the workhouse as an ordinary pauper.

1174. Chairman.] In fact, he would be treated as a casual pauper is now treated if it is found that he requires longer relief than the ordinary term for which a casual pauper stays; that is to say, he would be transferred to the workhouse.

That is so.

1175. Earl of Aberdeen.] Do you find an increase or a decrease in the number of tramps requiring to be treated in that way?

We have had very few indeed this last winter.

1176. I think you mentioned that it frequently happens that cases under consideration for charitable relief are referred back for further report in two weeks' time?

They are not referred back; we have to get the information as to what the Charity Organization Committee have done, and report that within two weeks to the guardians.

1177. Meanwhile, what is done in a case of urgency?

If the Charity Organization Committee find it a case of urgency, they deal with it as such; if not, we do. I have found cases where I have had to do it myself.

1178. Is there a difficulty as to the charitable funds?

I am not aware that there is.

1179. Earl
1179. Earl of Strafford.] Have you heard of an amateur house of refuge or casual shelter which has been started in the East-end of London by Mr. Harold Bolton, and other gentlemen of benevolent views?
I think that is the house of shelter to which I have referred.

1180. How does that work?
Pretty well, I think, on the whole.

1181. Do you know at all the number of persons who have been accommodated there during the last five winter months?
I do not. I have been there on several occasions when there have been 30 or 40 there.

1182. I suppose the relief given is very simple; they only get some bread and water, nothing more luxurious?
It is nothing very enticing; besides, unless they are men who really want work, they will not go there, because they have to turn out very early in the morning to search for work.

1183. At what time do they turn out?
At five o'clock.

1184. At what hour are they admitted?
After eight o'clock.

1185. Is there any porridge given to them?
I do not know what is the exact diet.

1186. In Stepney you have a good many private benevolent institutions and benefit societies established, have you not?
Of a small character. We have no large charities.

1187. Do you know anything of the Stepney Relief Society?
Yes, but that does not operate much in the Stepney Union; it is more in the parish of Mile End, which is called Stepney. There is one part of the hamlet of Ratcliffe which comes into that district.

1188. Does that society give pensions?
It gives pensions of 5 s. a week to old people, and half-a-crown a week to old people of good character during the winter months.

1189. I suppose that society has done a certain amount of good?
Yes, it bears a very good name.

1190. Is there any other society of that character within your union?
Only the Tower Hamlets Pension Society.

1191. That is a society which only gives pensions, I suppose, to men and women who are not able any longer to work?
Yes.

1192. Is that supported by the industrial classes by means of weekly subscriptions?
No, it is purely a voluntary charity.

1193. And it is not dependent upon any weekly or monthly contributions from the working classes themselves?
None.

1194. How would you compare the distress of last winter, 1887-88, with that of the winter of 1886-87; has it been more or less severe?
If the distress be measured by the demand for relief I think it must have been less.

1195. Of course the weather has something to do with it. Do you think the decrease of distress is owing to a little more work having been found during the past winter than during the previous winter?
Men have not been so continuously out of work; they have had a few days' work here and there.

(70.) S 1196. Within
1196. Within your union there is a large number of dock labourers who come to you for relief, is there not?
There is.

1197. And they suffer very much, I suppose, when there is a very severe and continuous frost?
The bricklayers' labourers suffer most from that cause.

1198. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] You spoke at the beginning of your evidence about the Sutton Schools, with which I have considerable personal acquaintance; the children are sent there as a relief to widows who have been left with large families; I suppose those children can be taken out on notice?
Yes; if the mother of a child wishes to have the child she comes before the guardians on the Thursday, and she will get the child on the following Tuesday. If the case is urgent, the child will be brought quicker.

1199. What check have you upon that power of withdrawing the children, because, conceivably, it might be exercised very inconveniently and expensively on the guardians?
There is nothing at present to prevent a woman from having her child. It is her child and she has a perfect right to it.

1200. She might have it backwards and forwards?
That would be at the option of the guardians. The guardians might say, "You shall not send it to the school again without becoming an inmate of the workhouse."

1201. And that would be a check?
It would.

1202. When the children have reached a certain age they are provided with employment, are they not?
The boys are apprenticed, and the girls are sent to service.

1203. You spoke about able-bodied men of good character being taken into the house, with liberty of leaving their wives and families outside, so as not to break up the home, and I thought you said something about a labour-test for such men; what did you mean by that?
The labour-test would be the workhouse. Going into the workhouse is a labour-test instead of being taken into the labour-yard.

1204. Have they any labour in the workhouse?
Yes, stone-breaking, wood-chopping, oakum-picking, &c. At Whitechapel, I believe, they have other means of putting the people to work.

1205. Do you think that it would be possible, without any very great expense or trouble, to have skilled labour for skilled artizans?
I have no doubt that it could be done, but from my point of view it would be a serious injury to the country and to the people themselves.

1206. Will you explain why?
If anything be done in the workhouses of a profitable character, it must compete with the ratepayers outside. I cannot explain what I mean better than this: that in our workhouse the non-able-bodied chop wood, and the master supplies the various shopkeepers with the wood in bundles; and we have had several deputations waiting upon the guardians to complain of the impossibility of their competing against the labour which is done in the workhouse, and that it has shut up several persons from that calling outside. If that were to be done with trades, it would have, I fear, a like effect. Any work of a practical kind in the workhouse, if it were required to be done by a master to repair the house, might be done; but if articles are made for sale, they must compete with the articles produced by the general ratepayers.

1207. Chairman.] Do you charge the full market price for those billets of wood which are sold?
There is a fixed price. Dr. Barnardo is a great competitor with us, and we sell
Mr. is but undoubtedly what have lowered do increase charitable class, of relief, to Society continued the took country call system belter and not I see sales they complain they sell our wood at the same price as Dr. Barnardo sells his. The price charged by the workhouse is the price in the market; but what the people outside complain of very much is this, that they cannot make a bundle so large for the same money as the people inside can, and therefore they say: "We are paying our rates to support people who compete against us outside."

1208. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Even although it lowered the rates individually?
Yes.

1209. Earl of Aberdeen.] Do they complain of Dr. Barnardo's wood chopping sales:
No; Dr. Barnardo's is a voluntary arrangement, and therefore they think they have no right to complain.

1210. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Do you think, speaking from your experience, that it would be possible so to improve the system of poor law relief as ultimately to diminish, if not to remove, the necessity for private systematic philanthropy?
That opens a very wide question. I do not care whether it be private or not; what I want to see is the rich and the poor brought together. I want to see the poor taught in some way or other better than they can teach themselves; and as long as it is left to the State to deal with the poor, so long will the better classes be kept away from them. Charity is undoubtedly fitful, and I should like to see tacked on to the poor law what is termed the Elberfeld system of out-door relief. I should be very glad to see the system of what we call relieving officers, at the present time, entirely abolished for out-door cases. It would take a much longer time than you would allow me to explain what I mean in that way; but I, myself, think that in a place like London charity will always be found to deal with the poor; whether or not it will be so in the country it is difficult for me to say.

1211. Of course you have come across many instances in which what may be called private charity has been foolishly and mischievously dispensed, and has hindered you, as an officer of the Poor Law, in doing your duty by the poor?
That is so, and more especially was it so before the organisation of charity took place, that is to say, before that society was formed. At that time it was the practice of the clergymen of the parish, wherever he found a poor person, either himself to come, or to write a letter to the relieving officer, wishing him to deal with such a case and give it relief. From the time the guardians discontinued the practices which were then in force, the recommendations of the clergymen have fallen away; and, instead of clergymen referring cases to the poor law authorities, I refer cases to them; that has been the effect of the working of the system in bringing really the charitable element more to bear.

1212. Can you suggest any further expedient by which charitable relief, so to speak, can be made to co-operate more helpfully and usefully with poor law relief, because surely they might help each other if they must both exist?
I can only suggest that they should rally round the Charity Organisation Society as a central element.

1213. It is your opinion that that is a valuable and well worked organization?
I speak of the Stepney committee as being well worked, and I can also speak of a neighbouring one in St. George's-in-the-East, where a vast amount of good work has been done.

1214. Do you consider on the whole that the feeling of self-respect among the working classes with regard to receiving poor law or other relief is on the increase?
Amongst a certain class self-respect is on the increase; but there is a certain class, which in my paper I have termed the hereditary class, who have no self-respect. All they care for is getting what they can. I am sorry to speak of my fellow beings in such terms, but it is my experience, and it is those that we want charitable persons to help to reform. The poor law finds a person poor and in a
low condition of society; it relieves him and then leaves him in the same condition. It has no way of lifting him out of the mire. Once a pauper always a pauper.

1215. Is that hereditary class increasing?
No.

1216. What would you do with it?
Wherever it required relief I should offer it the workhouse, and no other relief, unless there is urgent necessity.

1217. And there is no other way which you can think of for dealing with what I hope I am not unreasonable in calling a mischievous class than the workhouse?
There is no other way for the law to deal with it; but charity, man to man, might deal with it, and draw them or drag them, as it were, from their present condition. That is what we want to see brought about.

1218. Much of that class, I suppose, is the tramp or vagrant class?
No, I am speaking of the migratory classes of London, especially who live in homes of misery. When I tell you that in some cases a father, a mother, and six or seven children, ranging from seventeen or eighteen years of age down to infancy, are all living and sleeping perhaps in two or three small rooms, how can they be improved? They live under conditions as low as the animal, and it requires, not the poor law, but a superior mind, a feeling of charity, to raise them.

1219. Could not that superior mind be brought to bear upon them through the organization of the poor law?
No.

1220. Why not?
If you made the Poor Law a charity, as the Charity Organization Society is, then you could do so; but the Poor Law is a right, and persons would take advantage of that right and demand it in the same way. The Poor Law has no meaning of drawing persons together. The body of guardians have no way whatever of finding out the wants of the people, nor of bringing outside influences to bear. But if that superior mind is to be attached to the Poor Law through the failure of personal charity, then you should have a system analogous to the Elberfeld system, in co-operation with the present workhouse system, by which the rich and poor would be brought together.

1221. Just now you said that you had to make a good many inquiries as to character; I suppose the inquiries as to character would not imply or involve any further inquiries?
No. As relieving officer my duty is simply to inquire and to tabulate results.

1222. Lord Balfour.] You state, I think, as your opinion, that your system in Stepney is not productive of any hardship whatever to those who require relief?
None whatever. I have carefully watched that by visiting their homes from time to time after relief has been refused.

1223. Is there any pressure brought upon your guardians or upon yourself at the present time to return to the system of giving more out-door relief?
No.

1224. Public opinion is absolutely at rest as to your proceedings?
I read this paper on April 20th, and it was discussed by the local people. There were, I think, ten speakers, and only one, I think, spoke against the system of restricting relief, and the reason which he gave was this: "I think out-relief is the best because the people think so, and if an election were to take place upon the system of out-door relief, the guardians who went in for out-door relief would be returned."

1225. Have you a reasonable continuity in your elected guardians as well as in the nominated ones?
Since 1879, I think, I am not certain about the year, we have had a fair continuity. In 1878 or 1879, there was an outcry against the principle, and in one of the districts, the Limehouse division, every guardian was turned out.

1226. Are the whole of the guardians elected every year?
Yes.

1227. Do
30th April 1888.]
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1227. Do you find any disadvantage from that system; would you prefer to see one-third of them go out every year?
If as an officer I might be allowed to express my opinion, that is the proper way.

1228. Have you any complaints from neighbouring Unions that your strict system of administering the law throws a greater burden upon them?
This gentleman who spoke against my paper said that it was so in Poplar.

1229. Have you had any complaints from neighbouring Unions?
Poplar is a neighbouring Union. The only complaint that I have had is from that gentleman.

1230. Have any of the Unions round about you attempted to transfer paupers under the law of settlement to you?
Yes.

1231. Has that been attempted in many cases?
I do not know that it has been done in many cases, but there are a few occasionally. Poplar and Mile End do it; I do not think Whitechapel does so; St. George's does, I know, occasionally, and we do the same to them.

1232. But St. George's is under practically the same system as you are under, is it not?
It is. This gentleman said that Poplar suffered from the restriction of relief in Stepney, and that people, not being able to get relief in Stepney, migrated to Poplar. It so happened that I remembered a special case that he mentioned, in which a person applied to the guardians for out-door relief. In my inquiries I found what the character of the person was, and visiting her home I found her drunk on the floor, so that she was not able to get out of my way; the relief was refused by the Stepney guardians, and she went to Poplar and received it.

1233. What led you to take action, such as you have described, when you first entered your office?
My feelings towards my fellow men, and seeing the injury that the Poor Law was doing in demoralising the people.

1234. Can you give me some recollections?
I can tell you of the people who were in the habit of coming to me for relief. The guardians at that time were not fixed, and I do not know whether they had principles or not; but I first commenced with a very small district. I had two sisters who were in receipt of relief; one was getting 2s. a week, and the other 1s. 6d. The first thing I found out was that they had a pension from the Trinrity House of 2s. and something each. I then found that they were very great drinkers, and on one occasion I met one of them in the street reeling drunk. She fell down and cracked her head and was taken to the hospital. When she got better I reported the case to the guardians. The vice chairman asked the woman whether what I said was true. She said: "No, Mr." (calling him by his name), "if the officer" (calling me by name), "says so he must have been drunk, and not myself." That relief, I am sorry to say, was continued for a time. On another occasion I reported the sister for drunkenness. I need not say that that relief was continued. A short time afterwards she was burnt to death. I have known able-bodied men who had something the matter in their families come to the guardians for relief and get it. I have seen the sick patent left without it, and I have seen the people feeding on the mutton chops that were given to them for the sick patients; and I have seen them drunk on the wines and brandies which were at that time given in abundance.

1235. It is circumstances such as that, I understand, which led you in the paper which you have put in to express the opinion that even in the case of the sick the treatment in your infirmaries and asylums should be adopted as far as possible?
It is so.

1236. Can you tell the Committee anything as to the relative cost in your union of the system which you now pursue compared with the system of eighteen years ago. It is sometimes said to the Committee that even though the proportion of indoor relief is greater now than it used to be, the aggregate cost is not diminished,
diminished, and it is alleged that a moderate out-relief is cheaper than an extensive application of the workhouse test. Can you give the Committee your experience on that point?

I think I can. Taking the half-year ending Lady-day the 25th of March 1869, 1,708 persons were relieved by indoor relief, at a cost of 6,344 l. , which is about 12,600 l. for the year. During the same half-year 7,602 persons received out-door relief at a cost of 6,153 l., or over 12,000 l. for the year. In the corresponding half-year of 1887, 1,670 persons received indoor relief at a cost of 5,389 l., or about 10,700 l. for the year; but during this half-year only 218 l. was given in out-door relief, which would be about 436 l. for the year. Notwithstanding this great diminution in the out-door relief, the weekly payments per head have been materially increased; in 1869 it was about 1 s. 6 d. per head, whereas in 1888 it is 4 s. 6 d. per head.

1237. I understand that you attach great importance to adherence to decisions once given.

I do. It provokes importunity if it is known that the guardians, having once decided a case upon its merits, are open to reconsider it. The people try, and try and try, or go to some clergyman or some ratepayer to write a letter for them, which by-and-by induces some guardian to take the case up, although previously the case had been decided upon its merits.

1238. In one page of your pamphlet you recommend a judicious application of the law of settlement; what do you mean to convey by that phrase?

Not removing every person who may become chargeable as soon as he is chargeable; but to remove to their places of settlement persons who may belong to Scotland, or to Ireland, or to some other parts of the country if they are likely to become permanent charges upon us.

1239. But if they have a chance of getting work where they are it is better to leave them at the place where they have taken up their abode?

That is my view.

1240. Can you say in the years over which you have chiefly had experience, whether there has been any migration of agricultural population from the country into your district for the purpose of seeking work?

I do not think so to any large extent. Families do come occasionally, but not in any large bodies.

1241. Do you come across them amongst the dock labourers?

That is just where they are. Sometimes a gardener will come up from the country to live in London to work. I have known them come from Devonshire and elsewhere, because the wages are not very large in the country. I am a Somerset man myself, and not long since I came across a Devonshire gardener who said that he had heard so much about the wages that were paid in London that he thought he would be better off for coming, but he was worse off, because in Exeter he had constant employment of 17 s. a week, whereas in London, though he got 4 s. or 5 s. a day, he did not get more than 17 s. a week on the average.

1242. The movement has not been such as to call for any great remark?

No.

1243. Earl of Milltown.] Is it your experience that the same feeling of self-respect which, greatly to their honour, deter the poor from wishing to enter the workhouse would deter them from accepting outdoor relief?

No, it is the outdoor relief they covet. They do not call themselves paupers if they have outdoor relief.

1244. Supposing the case of a poor person who, from a feeling of self-respect, declined to enter the workhouse; would the same feeling of self-respect cause him to decline to accept outdoor relief?

No.

1245. Lord Thring.] Some of your most valuable evidence is that a perfect system of dealing with the poor depends upon a perfect co-operation between the Poor Law and charity, as I understand it?
It does to a large extent. As I said in the early part of my evidence, under a strict administration, on the principles on which legal relief ought to be administered, the Poor Law could do a great deal of it, but it could not bring the better mind to bear in the way of advice, &c., to the poor people.

1246. Can you suggest any improvement in the law by which this co-operation could be promoted; for instance, would it be advisable to make the law with regard to outdoor relief stricter in order to force, as it were, greater charity?

Speaking for myself, I should like to see outdoor relief by the guardians, or by the Poor Law, abolished, with the exception of what I should call very urgent cases.

1247. And you think that that would, to use a rather harsh term, force charity into the field to relieve any difficulties that might arise?

If it did not force charity, it would force another system. Charity, I hope, would take its place.

1248. I am afraid that this excellent system which you have in Stepney involves much more work upon the relieving officer in making reports, and much more writing; you have a much more complete system of cases before you, have you not?

Yes.

1249. Would you, or would you not, consider it right that it should be legally made necessary that the local records should be fuller?

If it was determined to continue the administration of outdoor relief under the Poor Law, then the system of inquiries and recording should be made somewhat more like that of the Charity Organization.

1250. Chairman.] What is your practice as relieving officer with regard to keeping a record?

First of all, the guardians have supplied me with a book of a certain form, which we call our record book. The other form is the report which we make to the guardians of certain cases. The matter is drawn from our record book. That is really a summary to place before the guardians. That form is in a book, which is indexed. (The forms are put in. See Appendix.)

1251. I understand you, in effect, to recommend that some similar form should be adopted as being more exhaustive than the present system?

I do.

1252. Besides that record which you have referred to, you present to the guardians a digest of the case, which, in point of fact, is your report as to the case?

That is so.

1253. It contains, I observe, all the information which is contained in the record, with some besides?

It does.

1254. For example, whether the destitution is chronic, whether there is evidence of thrift, what is the character of the family, the reliability of references and informants?

Yes.

1255. Besides that, it gives the time in the Poor Law district, the time that the person has been without employment, if he has received parish relief before; and finally, I observe, that you report whether to force the applicant into the workhouse would be a hardship?

Yes.

1256. Lord Thring.] You attach considerable importance upon that form, do you not?

I do.

(70.)

1257. I think
1257. I think you also suggest that practically there should be inter-communication of information; in fact, an interchange of reports between union and union, and between relieving officer and relieving officer? Yes.

1258. And you wish, of course, that that should be embodied in an order of the Local Government Board? I do.

1259. With respect to the election of guardians, I understand you to lay considerable stress on continuity, so far as is reasonable in boards of guardians? I do.

1260. Would your opinion be that the guardians should go out in triennial rotation in preference to their going out altogether at a particular moment? Yes.

1261. Is there any other point that you would like to mention? With reference to men out of work, and the disturbance that took place in 1887, I may mention that on the 1st of January 1887, a body of between 100 and 200 Socialists came to the outside doors of my office. Their demand was to see the guardians. A deputation was admitted. The clerk was in attendance to represent the guardians. Those people demanded relief, either by a labour test or by some other test. I had heard that they were coming, and I therefore communicated with the officer who has to superintend the roads, and I asked him to meet me there, and I also asked him to be prepared to take on some men to work as a test. After talking to them for a long time, I requested two things of them: first, to send me the names and addresses of all the men who were there out of work amongst that crowd in my district; and I said that if they would send me their names and addresses their cases should be inquired into and reported upon fully to the guardians for their consideration. Next I told them that if they wished for relief at this moment, the only thing that I could give them was admission to the workhouse, promising to provide for their families whilst they were there. Then I asked them if any of them were prepared to say that they would go to work on a job on the Monday, this being on the Saturday. They said yes. On Monday morning 30 men went to the Limehouse Board of Works, which is the sanitary authority of the Stepney Union having the care of the streets. They were put on at 5 o'clock in the morning, and all supplied with tools to go to work. At breakfast-time, out of the 30, 22 had left; eight of the men went on for one week, and afterwards they were no more seen. Out of all the men who accompanied the socialist leaders, and who were all said to be out of work, not a single man accepted an order for the workhouse, nor did the leaders of the men send to me a single name or address as requested to do, so that I might make enquiries into their condition.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, is called in: and Examined, as follows:

1262. Chairman.] I think you have been a guardian of the poor in the parish of Marylebone? Yes.

1263. Are you still a guardian? No, I am not. I have been a guardian for two different periods; I have been now over 30 years a clergyman in Marylebone, having been before that in the East of London; and soon after I went to Marylebone I became a guardian and served between four and five years. In the year 1877 I joined the board again, and served for three years. Since that time I have not been a guardian.

1264. But
1264. But you have taken an interest since that time in the relief of the poor? I have always taken the deepest possible interest in the condition of the poor, and I have kept myself in close contact with the work of the guardians. I have studied every week the returns of the relief cases which have been before the guardians. I was also at one time on the School Board for London, and since the beginning of that work I have superintended the compulsory action of the Board over a large district, that of Lisson Grove, which is well known to philanthropists; and lately I have been remitting the fees for the Board in that same district, which includes a very large poor population; so that in every way I have had the closest relations with extreme poverty in both parts of London in large and populous districts.

1265. Has the system of diminishing the out-door relief been enforced in Marylebone of late years? A very considerable diminution of out-door relief has taken place, rather by stricter methods of inquiry and the like than by the adoption of any such principle as they have adopted in several unions in the East of London. During my late tenure of office as a guardian I was on the relief committee, and I became chairman of it. I devoted my attention very particularly to the work of out-door relief, and I may say that whilst I was chairman there was a considerable diminution in the number of out-door paupers. The diminution within the last 20 years has been very considerable. The highest number, in 1869, of out-door cases was 4,646, and the lowest number last summer was 749 only. So that without the adoption of a system of refusing out-door relief this very large diminution has taken place.

1266. I see that the figures given in a Return of the Local Government Board of the number of paupers relieved on the 1st of July 1887, to the 1st of January 1888, was, in Marylebone, 2,738 receiving in-door relief, being in the ratio of 17·7 per 1,000 of the population, and 913 receiving out-door relief, being in the ratio of 5·9 per 1,000 of the population. Can you compare those figures with any previous figures? I cannot give you the figures at an earlier date, but that number which I gave just now as the largest number of out-door cases, that is to say, 4,646 cases in 1869, might be compared with the lowest number last year, which was 749.

1267. Do you attribute this diminution in out-door relief largely to the operation of the Act by which the cost of the in-door poor is spread over the whole of the Metropolis? I doubt whether it was due very considerably to that cause. I do not think that that has told much upon the guardians of Marylebone.

1268. Then you attribute it rather to their administering the law more strictly, from a general opinion that a strict administration of the law was desirable? Yes. I think the chief reason has been that greater care has been taken to compel relatives to support those who were dependent upon them. When I first became acquainted with the condition of the poor I was very strongly impressed by the fact that there was a great looseness of ties between parents and children. It was common then, and I am sorry to say that it is not uncommon now, for parents in advanced age not to know where their children live. The children were unwilling to support their parents, and the parents were perhaps even more unwilling to become a burden to their children. I believe that the reduction which has taken place is due very largely to the fact that greater care has been taken, increasing care, I think, to see that children were called upon to perform their proper duty in the support of their parents.

(70.)

1269. Earl
1269. Earl of Milltown.] I suppose by children you do not mean children in age, but offspring?
Yes; grown-up sons and daughters; sons especially.
1270. Chairman.] But would not that cause apply equally to in-door paupers as to out-door paupers?
Undoubtedly.
1271. Then to what special cause do you attribute the great decrease in out-door pauperism, which I infer has taken place, as compared with the in-door pauperism?
To the great reluctance, of which everyone is aware, to go into the house. It is only when they are reduced to extreme necessity that poor persons will go into the house; and constantly if the sons and daughters think that their parents can obtain out-door relief they will do nothing for them; but in order to prevent their going into the house they would do something. The parent will insist upon help from the children in order to avoid going into the house when he or she would not do so to avoid applying for out-door relief.
1272. Have the guardians at Marylebone applied the in-door test more strictly of late years?
Certainly, in that way; that is to say, they have been much more careful in allowing out-door relief; in that way they have applied the in-door test more strictly.
1273. I observe that the ratio of out-door relief per 1,000 of the population in Marylebone, according to this return, was 5.9, the average for London being 10.9, and in one union it being as high as 32.4. I conclude that we may infer from these figures, that in Marylebone the Poor Law is rather strictly administered as regards out-door relief?
Certainly.
1274. Has there been any attempt in Marylebone to put an end almost entirely to out-door relief, in the same way as it has been reduced in some of the East-end parishes?
I did what I could in that direction; but I stood almost alone amongst the guardians in desiring very strongly that out-door relief should be abolished. I have always contended that there, in particular, it would be perfectly possible to abolish out-door relief without any bad consequences; but I was not able to carry a majority of the guardians with me.
1275. Have you a labour yard in Marylebone?
We have had a temporary labour yard.
1276. But you have no permanent labour yard?
No, there is none now.
1277. With regard to the aged and infirm poor, were they generally given out-door relief, or was the workhouse offered to any considerable number of that class?
It was understood that an aged person who was disabled and was of respectable character, and who had no sons or daughters who could support him, should, as a matter of course, have out-door relief, and that is still very much the assumption.
1278. Do you think that a sound practice?
What I feel, perhaps, more than anything, is the importance of uniformity; that it should be perfectly well understood by the poor themselves, and by other outsiders, what the rule is upon which the guardians act; but, as I have already said, I think it would be much better (and I speak entirely with an eye to the moral character and the general elevation of the poor) that they should not be able to look to out-door relief in old age.
1279. If the system which you recommend were adopted, would it not be necessary to supplement the poor relief by a complete charitable organization?
It would be most desirable, and I think that would be one of the results of abolishing outdoor relief. At present there is considerable uncertainty in people's minds as to whether relief will be obtained from the guardians or not, and that effectually prevents any thorough systematic organization of charity. But I have no doubt that if a strict rule were adopted by the guardians, and it were known that there was to be no outdoor relief, steps would immediately be taken to provide for any poor persons whom it would be fitting and proper to keep out of the workhouse.

1280. Had you any system of charitable organization connected with the Poor Law relief in Marylebone?

We had none connected with it in any direct way. We have a Committee of the Charity Organization Society in Marylebone.

1281. But you did not work in concert with it?

We worked so far in concert that some of the best guardians have been, from time to time, active members of the Charity Organization Society, and every now and then a case which the guardians refused to help is referred by them to the Charity Organization Society; that is to say, the poor person is directed to apply to that Society.

1282. So that you have, to a certain extent, inter-communication between the board of guardians and the Charity Organization Society?

Yes.

1283. Do you think that that might with advantage be extended further?

I think the only chance of it would be the institution of a very strict and uniform system of relief on the part of the guardians; I should say the abolition of out-door relief as in the unions of the East of London.

1284. It has been suggested to us by a previous witness that where an able-bodied man is offered the workhouse, and is obliged to accept it for want of means, but where the family are respectable, and it is probable that he may before long be able to find work again, it would be desirable that the guardians should be empowered to give relief to the wife and children out of the house, so as to prevent the home being broken up; do you think that that suggestion is a good one?

I think it might, on the whole, be advantageous. I do not think it would be much used, and I do not think, speaking from my own experience, that there is any very great call for it. It is a rare thing for an able-bodied man to go into the workhouse. I should be surprised to hear of a case of a thoroughly respectable able-bodied man going into the workhouse. As regards the breaking up of the home, in nearly all cases the poor are ready to sacrifice their furniture, almost to the last point, rather than go into the workhouse, or rather than that the able-bodied men should go into the workhouse. I do not think it would be extensively used, and I do not think it would meet any urgent practical need; but I think it might be useful on other grounds, partly as an answer to objections which might be raised.

1285. What is the present system in Marylebone with regard to the children who have to be maintained out of the rates; are they sent to cottage homes or to a general district school?

They are sent to a school of their own at Southall, which belongs to Marylebone only.

1286. Are you well acquainted with that school?

I should not claim any close acquaintance with it; I do not visit it regularly.

1287. Is it a large school?

Yes, it is a large school.

1288. Do you know the number of children in it?

Some 400 or 500.

1289. Do you think that the plan of collecting together a very large number of children in one institution is a good one?

(70.) I am
I am bound to say that in Marylebone experience is not against the plan. The children, on the whole, turn out well enough. I sympathise a great deal with those who argue in favour of cottage homes, but I cannot say that our own experience in Marylebone can at all be adduced against schools of this kind. At the time when I was first a guardian, more than 20 years ago, there was a great complaint about workhouse schools, and I caused inquiry to be made as to the circumstances of those who had left the school for the two or three years before; and in almost all cases they were doing respectfully and well, and so far as I know now there is no reason at all to complain of the results of the education of the children in the Southall School. The guardians do their best to introduce every improvement possible into the schools, and to administer them as well as they can, and they find good places for the children; and I must say that I do not think there is anything to be said against the system as it is worked in Marylebone.

1290. Are any children boarded out?
I think none.

1291. Had you any special mode of dealing with widows with children in Marylebone; did they usually receive out-door relief, or what was the practice?
They received generally, or those who had over two children, at all events, could count on receiving at the rate of 1s. 6d. per child; and of those who receive out-door relief now a large proportion are widows with children.

1292. Do you think that in a large town very poor widows with four or five children are in a position, when assisted by small sums in that way, to bring their children up properly?
It is a most trying position. What impresses me very much is, that I know from time to time of cases in which widows do it, and do it with fair success, even without any parish relief at all, which makes me feel that it is almost unfair to them that others should be aided. No doubt the task is one of extreme difficulty. An immense proportion of the cases of truant children which present difficulty to the School Board are the children of widows and of widowers, from the obvious cause that the parent goes out to work and leaves the children to go to school, and then the children get into careless and truant habits and turn out badly.

1293. We were informed by the previous witness that in Stepney Union, where a widow with several children applied for out-door relief, the guardians, after ascertaining her circumstances and determining how many children she can properly support, offer her relief for the other children in their schools, and that if she does not accept that she has an order for the house, the result being that it scarcely ever happens that a widow does take an order for the house, but that the children are given up to the guardians to be sent to school; do you think that that system would work well generally?
Yes; I am satisfied that it would on the whole. Of course, that must be the system where out-door relief is refused. It is so in those East London unions in which relief is refused, and to a very considerable extent it is done in Marylebone. Wherever the widow is of a character not to be trusted, but has, say, four or five children, some of the children are taken into the schools and she has no out-door relief, and I see no sufficient reason why that should not be extended to all. In many cases some persons would come forward to help the widow to retain the children; but I do not think it would be a serious injury to the children to be taken into the schools instead of being brought up at home under these disadvantageous circumstances.

1294. Have you any experience of the treatment of the casual poor in Marylebone?
Not any that I should think of any value.

1295. Do you think that there is a tendency on the part of the working classes
classes to regard with more or with less favour the obtaining of relief from the poor rates?

I think that the difference is between receiving out-door relief and in-door relief. The administration of the law has become so considerate and courteous, that I do not think that there is any objection at all to receiving out-door relief; in fact, I have been surprised by finding that persons whom I had relieved from my own parish funds applied to the relieving officer at a subsequent time rather than come to me again. I can hardly understand why it is, but my belief is that they think they have a right to the out-door relief, and that they are not begging of individuals; but if they come and ask help from me, or from other individuals, it is asking them to put their hands into their own pockets, and, therefore, that it is easier for them to apply for out-door relief than it is to apply for charitable assistance. I believe that the people would more easily apply to the relieving officer than they would either to the Charity Organization Society or to the clergyman.

1296. That would be a strong argument for restricting, as much as possible, out-door relief, would it not?

It seems to me to be an exceedingly strong argument. There is no roughness now in the treatment of the poor; there is nothing to humiliate them in the receiving of out door relief. As regards in-door relief, going into the house, I believe that the chief feeling against it is a dislike to the confinement and the control to which they are subject there. The dress, no doubt, may seem to them humiliating, but the real thing which they dislike is the imprisonment of the house; and, considering that the life is made on the whole so comfortable, speaking comparatively, I think it is a point of extreme importance that we have that convenient test, that we have that power of repelling them, I mean, their extreme dislike to being controlled and shut up. So that I should say there is an increasing dislike to go into the house, because there is an increasing sense of independence among the poor, and a desire for the enjoyment of freedom; but there is very little reluctance to receive out-door relief in the way in which it is now administered.

1297. Supposing that there were to be established in Marylebone, for example, a complete system of charitable organization, which should deal with all cases which, with few exceptions, were not cases for the house, would it not be necessary that that organization should be conducted according to very strict rules, and by persons who would exercise the utmost discrimination in granting relief?

Undoubtedly.

1298. And, if it were not so, might not the result be that you would have an imperfect Poor Law system existing side by side with the other system, the money for the support of which was levied only from a portion of the community, and the results of which might be, on the whole, perhaps, as injurious to the population as the receipt of Poor Law relief under strict regulation?

I quite admit the danger; but the very fact of making an attempt to deal with the matter in a more thorough way, which would be necessitated by an abolition of out-door relief, would introduce more care and discretion into the administration of charity. No one has anything to do for any time with the Charity Organisation Society without coming in contact with the facts and being impressed with the extreme danger of careless almsgiving; so that I think anything that caused a larger and wider system of charitable relief to be established, would lead to more knowledge and more consideration.

1299. Do you think that voluntary workers could be found willing and able to administer that kind of charity on a large scale?

Yes, I do not doubt it.

1300. Is there anything that you would like to add to the evidence which you have already given?
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During this period that we have been touching upon, the last 20 or 30 years, I think that, in part owing to stricter administration of relief, in part to other causes, there has been a most remarkable improvement in the condition and habits of the working people. I am very much struck with the greater thrift and the many signs of an improved condition. Very much is done now to make provision by clubs and associations of different kinds, and the most important of these movements seem to originate amongst the people themselves. A particular instance brought that to my mind very forcibly a few years ago. In a dense population near my own parish, a club had failed, that is to say, the treasurer had failed to pay at Christmas time the money that was due to the depositors, and 800 women were to be robbed of 30 s. a-piece. It was a tradesman who had started this club, and 800 of these too-confiding people had put their money in, and were to receive at Christmas 30 s. There are other societies of a similar kind which are almost unknown, started by the working people themselves, and some of them are especially called slate clubs, where the payment is at the rate of 6 d., with additions per week, and then there is a distribution at Christmas. Sometimes in a family the man will belong to one club and the woman to another, and sometimes the man will belong to two; and then there will be very considerable receipts in the winter time, which help to tide over a period of want of employment. In my own parish we have both sorts of clubs; we have a women's club, and we returned 30 s. each to 500 women this last Christmas. That is one of the ways in which they are led to make provision for themselves, and I think the more they understand that they are not to look to out-door relief, the more they will take to modes of provision of this kind, methods which will enable them to maintain themselves. Then working men in general now feel it a duty to belong to a club which maintains them in sickness as well. I always assume that every decent working man will provide for himself by belonging to a club. The improvement going on in this respect throughout London seems to me one of the strongest reasons why there should be no relaxation of any strictness of Poor Law administration, but, on the contrary, why everything should be done to assist the people in not depending upon obtaining relief upon easy terms.

1301. How did the guardians deal with the case where a man received a sum weekly from his benefit club; did they, in calculating whether he could support himself, take into consideration the whole of what he received, or did they make, as it were, any allowance out of that which they supplemented by relief?

There would be no question of a man receiving out-door relief as long as he was receiving the full benefit from his club; it would amount to 10 s. or 12 s. a week, if not more. A reduced allowance would be taken into account by the guardians as any other receipts would.

1302. But they would treat the receipts from the benefit society in the same way as they would treat the receipts from any other source?

Yes.

1303. Have you ever at all considered whether it would be possible to enforce compulsory insurance upon every man in the country, with a view to provision for sickness and old age?

I have never been persuaded that it would be a practicable or desirable scheme.

1304. Earl of Aberdeen.] The case of the club which you mentioned was not very encouraging to provident habits, was it?

No; but it is very curious how little effect it has upon the poor. They take such an incident in a light-hearted way for the most part. Clubs break up and they start again, and the depositors do not seem to be much discouraged by it; but it makes it very important, of course, that sound clubs should be brought within their reach.

1305. Has
1305. Has any method occurred to you, by which the formation of sound clubs for the poor could be encouraged?

A great deal can be done by the clergy, and by charitable persons, and a great deal is done now.

1306. Do such societies, as the Odd Fellows, have an important influence in encouraging thrift and providence? 

Undoubtedly.

1307. Is that society extending? 

I do not happen to know. The great benefit clubs are on an immense scale.

1308. You mentioned that the treatment of applicants for outdoor relief is more courteous and considerate than it used to be; would the same remark apply to applicants for indoor relief? 

Yes. People do not quite understand the reluctance to go into the house, and I came across what seemed to me a most curious instance of public feeling in the matter the other day. I found that certain ladies were starting a prayer union, to dispose the hearts of workhouse officials to be more humane in their behaviour; because there was so much dislike on the part of the poor to go into the house, and it was taken for granted that this was on account of the very unkind treatment which they received in the house. That is utterly without foundation.

1309. Is it not the case that, owing to the very rough class of people who perhaps form the majority of the inmates of the workhouse, certain rigorous methods of treatment in the house have to be adopted, which are quite unnecessary for a more respectable class of persons, who yet have to be subject to treatment which is necessary for the inferior class? 

There must be strict control; no doubt those who are disorderly kick against it and suffer accordingly; but I do not think that that brings any worse treatment on the others.

1310. Is it not one important reason for the dislike which respectable people have to the workhouse, the fact that a great stigma attaches to the inmates of a workhouse, because of the inferior character of many of those who resort to it, and who have no dislike to going into the workhouse except on account of the restraint? 

I should not say so.

1311. Is it not your experience that members of the working classes generally look down upon anybody who has been driven to the workhouse, or that workhouse children for instance are liable to be jeered at by other children? 

It is not my experience at all.

1312. There has been a great improvement perhaps in that respect? 

I think so.

1313. If it is not the case that one reason why the guardians are so careful to get children removed from the surroundings of the workhouse, or to board them out, or to send them to schools away from their own union, is because it is a great drawback to the children to be regarded as workhouse children? 

I think there is an impression that it is so; but I cannot say that that is sustained by anything within my knowledge.

1314. I was alluding only to the impression on the part of the poor, without reference to whether it is well founded or not? 

I am not aware of it in our neighbourhood.

1315. It would be a healthy impression in one sense, would it not? 

Decidedly; and I should not regret it.

1316. In Marylebone was there any difficulty, in your experience, with regard to persons applying for discharge, and then applying for re-admission, what have been called an in-and-out class of paupers? 
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Yes;
Yes; there is very little power of checking that sort of thing. It is done incessantly; and the guardians feel a strong desire that something should be done to check it more than it is checked, but nothing effectual is done.

1317. Do you think that it would be possible to meet that evil to any extent, by so classifying the inmates of the workhouse, that persons of that description would be subject to much more rigorous discipline than others who were driven to the workhouse, not by idleness, but by misfortune?

It would be very difficult to devise anything sufficiently rigorous which would not offend public sentiment.

1318. I am referring, of course, to the distinction between the more deserving and the disreputable?

So I understand; but I apprehend that not only would it be rather difficult in many workhouses, but also that any rigorous methods would excite a good deal of unpopularity, and that it would be very difficult to enforce them. But something might be done, perhaps, in that way.

1319. Earl of Strafford.] Have you ever visited any of the large pauper schools near London; at Hanwell, for instance?

No. I was mentioning that we had a school of our own belonging to Marylebone, at Southall, which I have often visited.

1320. I think I gathered from previous answers of yours, that you are satisfied with the way in which the children are cared for; you think it is as good as being boarded out in private homes?

I think I may say so. My prejudice would be rather in favour of children being boarded out, but the present system does not work badly in Marylebone.

1321. And I suppose there is a constant supervision and inspection of these schools?

Yes; great care is taken. The guardians are very much afraid of abuses occurring if children are boarded out; whereas they feel that if they have them in their own school, they can exercise better care over them.

1322. How long have these schools in connection with Marylebone been in existence?

I think over twenty years.

1323. What number are generally there?

I think between 400 and 600, if I remember rightly, but the numbers vary a good deal.

1324. Earl of Milltown.] Is it, so far as you know, considered a greater degradation amongst the poor to go into the workhouse than to accept outdoor relief?

It is very difficult to distinguish between what they feel to be a degradation and what they extremely dislike. I know, and I am glad, that they dislike extremely to go into the house as a rule; but my belief is that it is partly on account of the dress which they wear, but much more on account of the confinement to which they are subjected there; the imprisonment, as it is.

1325. Then their dislike arises more from a feeling that it is a less agreeable way of receiving relief, than from a feeling that it is degrading to them?

That is my belief.

1326. I did not quite understand an answer which you made just now to the Noble Earl in the chair, when he asked you whether you thought it was desirable in some deserving cases, where the man's going into the house would necessitate the breaking up of the home, to give outdoor relief to the wife and children; you said in answer to that, as I understood, that they would rather sell every article of furniture than go into the house; but surely it is to avoid their being obliged to sell every article of furniture that the relief which my noble friend suggested would be given?
The question was with regard to a scheme for admitting the father of a family, the bread-winner, the able-bodied man, into the house; and I said that before he would go into the house, so that that system would come into force, he would make a great sacrifice. Therefore, no doubt that is an argument for out-door relief, because they would say: "Here are people parting with their furniture; will you not give them out-door relief to save them from that necessity." But that is another question altogether.

1327. *Chairman.* I understand you to mean this: that the family would be reduced to such extremities in all probability, before the head of the family would accept the order for the house, that, in point of fact, there would be no other means of the family continuing in the home?

That was my meaning: not carried to an extreme point, but that there would not be any very important amount of furniture left.

1328. And for that reason you thought that the cases in which it would be applicable would not be numerous?

*Quite so; that is what I meant to say.*

1329. *Earl of Milltown.*] With regard to these benefit societies, as I understand you, it is of frequent occurrence, or at any rate, not of very infrequent occurrence, that the poor get robbed by the managers of these societies?

*It is so, undoubtedly.*

1330. Are the persons who effect these heartless robberies prosecuted?

*It is extremely difficult to prosecute them. In the case to which I referred some attempts were made, but I think the parties disappeared; and very often it is not worth while to prosecute; there is nothing to be got by it, and the mode of prosecution is not a convenient one. It cannot be taken up by any outsider; there must be some action taken in a civil court by the sufferer, and unless there is something to be gained by it, no one is inclined to take it up.*

1331. Does not that rather point to the necessity of the Treasury or the Public Prosecutor taking up such prosecutions?

*It might be even sounder that the poor should become more careful, as I think they are becoming. I do not think it is a growing evil.*

1332. Still they are to a certain extent unprotected from this class of spoliation?

*There are cases in which there is direct fraud; but in the majority of cases undoubtedly it is simply carelessness and the fallacious assumptions upon which the clubs are founded that cause the loss. For a club to break up and fail to pay its obligations is not at all an uncommon thing; but the cases in which there is fraudulent spoliation form quite a minority.*

1333. Then how do the clubs break up in the other cases?

*The chief cause of their breaking up is that they have undertaken to pay more than the receipts will warrant them in paying, or the numbers fail, and in that way the receipts are insufficient.*

1334. But you do not find that the whole body of these small investors are discouraged from thrift by the losses sustained in this manner?

*Certainly not so much as I should have expected. Individuals must be discouraged undoubtedly; but the movement is not a declining one, but a greatly growing one, I believe.*

1335. *Lord Thring.*] The failures of most of the clubs are mere blunders, are they not; they promise too much?

*Yes.*

1336. And, therefore, they are not subjects for a criminal prosecution at all?

*No; it is only, as I have already stated, in a small number of cases that there is fraud.*

1337. Such cases must be very rare indeed?

*Yes.*

(70.)

1338. They
1338. They merely become criminal when there is direct embezzlement?
Yes.

1339. So that in effect it is almost always a civil debt, and no system of prosecution would remedy it?
I believe not.

1340. You said, in answer to the Chairman, that sometimes out-door relief was preferred to charity; do you not think that that may arise from the independence of the man who considers that he has a right to out-door relief, and therefore that he will not rob you, as his friend?
I think that may be partly the reason.

1341. It may be a mistaken feeling, but it is an honest feeling, and not a blamable one:
I only mentioned it as illustrating the fact that there is no very great unwillingness to apply for out-door relief.

1342. It may be a wrong feeling, but there is a widespread feeling in England that a man has a right to have, what I think the Chairman once called, his pension; he considers that the State is bound to give him out-door relief in the same way as I consider myself entitled to my pension; is not that the feeling?
I dare say that is the feeling that prevails, but it is very much modified by what they can get.

1343. I grant that it is a wrong feeling, but that does not militate against the independence or honesty of the man; he is simply acting under a mistake?
Yes.

1344. The feeling with regard to the house is quite a different feeling. First of all, I presume that he does not wish to associate with a great many of the people in the workhouse, and he thinks it is a stigma on him to go into the house?
If you were to ask him, he would certainly say that it was a stigma. I cannot analyse his motives with great confidence, but I am sure that it is dislike to the conditions of the workhouse, rather than any feeling of degradation, that keeps him out of the workhouse.

1345. If he considers the out-door relief as a right, it does not militate against his independence to accept the out-door relief?
No.

1346. I do not forfeit my independence by accepting what I consider to be a right, although I may be wrong in thinking it a right?
Quite so; but my only doubt would be whether the poor people have such a sense of right as you would have.

1347. Lord Balfour of Burley. I understand you to express the opinion that if, when a man with a wife and family becomes destitute, he is offered the workhouse, with the promise that his wife and family will be attended to, he rarely accepts it?
It has not been tried in my neighbourhood at all. There has been some trial of it I am aware, on a small scale, in St. George's.

1348. In giving the evidence that you have given upon that point, you were not speaking from your own personal experience?
I was not.

1349. Have you any recommendation to make as to a humane and judicious treatment of those persons who have striven to make some provision for old age, but who have not been able to make a sufficient provision; I mean by that some method by which a discrimination should be exercised between them and those who have made no provision at all?
I quite agree with those who hold that that cannot be done with advantage by the State, but that it ought to be done as effectually as possible by voluntary charity, and that there ought to be no great difficulty in doing it.

1350. Those
1350. Those slate clubs which you mentioned are, I think, purely annual concerns, are they not; by that I mean that the provision is made in spring, summer, and autumn, and if there is any surplus after providing for the exigencies of sickness, the balance is at once divided at about Christmas time, or the new year.

That is so, but there are elements of continuity. Many of these clubs have a superannuation fund which is a separate fund, associated with them, and is for the benefit of their members. Then there is this important point: that anyone who has joined one of these clubs when he is of a moderate age, and in good health, remains a member, and goes on contributing when he has ceased to be in good health, which he would not be able to do if they were entirely starting afresh at the beginning of the year. That is a very important point, because when a man begins to feel the need of a club he is disabled by age, or sickness, from joining one; but if he has joined one of those clubs, although it is annual, he has the right of continuing as a member.

1351. But what remains over to him, or to anybody else, after the funds are divided annually?

Every club requires a certificate from a doctor before it will receive a member; and if a man puts off joining a club until he is of a certain age or has lost his health, no club will take him. But if he has at an early age joined one of these clubs, which appears to be only an annual one, he has the right of continuing a member when his health has failed.

1352. But what good does it do to the existing subscribers to the club to know that this man has in previous years subscribed, and then at the end of the year spent his money.

There is no new formation of the club; it is recognised in all of them as a right that those who have been members before go on as members; and then if they fall ill they get the benefit of the allowance during their illness; but if they had not joined before the beginning of the year they would not have been allowed to join at all.

1353. Does it not amount to this then: that the younger members of these clubs who join in any given year are simply contracting to support any of those who have joined in previous years if they happen to fall ill during that year?

That is so. You cannot make it exactly fair, apparently, for all, and it is a disadvantage, if the condition of the clubs is looked into by a young man who thinks of joining, if he finds that a considerable proportion are aged members. But they do not scrutinize; they are not particular in making inquiries, and it very seldom operates as a repelling force from any club.

1354. Surely under these circumstance these slate clubs must be of very doubtful advantage?

Some think they are; but I cannot see any serious objection to them. They are a great convenience, and the payment can be made higher than it would otherwise be, so that it covers all possible demands upon it throughout the year. If a superannuation fund is connected with the club, as it is with a club in my parish, when a man is completely disabled from work he gets his allowance, and the whole thing works very fairly.

1355. Then in that case the funds are not all divided at the end of every year?

The superannuation fund is kept distinct; it is contributed to by special payments on the part of the members.

1356. I understood you to say that you are not convinced that any system of compulsory insurance was practicable; did I also correctly understand you to go so far as to say that, even if practicable, it would not be desirable.

I should hesitate to say that confidently. I see very strongly the advantages of it, but I think, perhaps, I express my feeling by saying it is impracticable. I think it would be accompanied by so much that it is disagreeable and annoying to most people that it could not be enforced.
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1357. Have you any experience which you could give to the Committee as to the relative effect upon the character of the poor of outdoor relief and indoor relief?

Speaking generally, I may say that I have the strongest possible feeling on the matter. There has been no other matter that has more interested me all my life, and that I have cared more about; and I have taken all the pains I can to verify and correct or support my opinion by the experience of those whose judgment I could trust; and I have no stronger conviction than that easy outdoor relief does a great mischief to the moral character of the poor, and that there is hardly anything which would be so certain to do them good as the refusing of outdoor relief. My feeling has arisen out of contact with the poor, almost exclusively.

1358. Would you agree with me in saying that the class that ought to be most considered in all matters affecting Poor Law legislation are those who are just above the line at which they think it necessary to apply for public relief, and that nothing should be done which will tend to increase the burden upon them and to make them contrast the inferiority of their position with that of those who have crossed the border-line and made application for relief?

I think that is extremely important; but nothing impresses me so much as the effect of easy relief upon the domestic relations of parents and children, and upon the feeling of domestic duty. That is more impressed upon my mind than any other circumstance, I think.

1359. Earl of Aberdeen.] In view of the great advantages which you have pointed out (and which I can quite see force of) of checking anything like extended out-door relief, would one not expect to find that the ratio of pauperism generally would correspond to the extent to which out-door relief was administered in any particular district. In unions where out-door relief is largely adopted, would you not expect to find that the total percentage of pauperism to the population would be greater than where out-door relief is largely restricted?

Yes; but I do not think you could compare one locality with another, because of the immense differences which exist. You might be comparing a very well-to-do neighbourhood with a very poor one. But if you compared the history of the same locality at different times and under different circumstances, I should entirely accept your view.

1360. I had in mind the unions of Marylebone and Islington respectively, which I imagined were not very dissimilar in character; are they tolerably similar as to the character of the population?

I could not speak with confidence about that.

1361. Have you observed that the proportion of indoor paupers in Marylebone was 17\(^{7}\) per 1,000, and of outdoor paupers only 5\(^{9}\) per 1,000; whereas in Islington the ratio per 1,000 of indoor pauperism is 7, and of outdoor pauperism 10\(^{1}\); so that the ratio per 1,000 of indoor and out-door pauperism together is larger in Marylebone than in Islington, being 23\(^{6}\) in Marylebone, and 17\(^{1}\) in Islington?

I think it would be necessary to know better than I do the relative character of the population in each of those parishes.

1362. But your experience generally is that the restriction of out-door relief tends to reduce the total percentage of pauperism?

Undoubtedly.

1363. Chairman.] With regard to the so-called slate clubs; I suppose that the possibility of providing for all the demands of the members really depends upon the amount of the contributions, and the calculations which are made as to the demands upon them?

Clearly.

1364. In
1364. In the case of all benefit societies, everything depends upon the basis being sound?
Yes.

1365. And in a large number of cases where benefit societies fail, they fail not from any dishonesty, but from the totally unsound basis upon which the society was originally founded?
Certainly.

1366. Have you had, of late years, any exceptional distress in Marylebone, so as to throw out of work at one time in the winter any large number of able-bodied men?
No: that is a point to which I have devoted careful attention, and it has seemed to me that the number of unemployed persons, whose employment naturally fails every winter, is tolerably uniform. I have been watching it closely for the last three years, and the account which people give of themselves is just the same. They are painters, and bricklayers’ labourers, and horsekeepers (who form a considerable element), or anybody of that sort, and the number of those out of work is always very considerable. It has not, I believe, increased of late years. I remember 30 years ago, seven persons who were painters making application to me in succession, and I have sometimes gone into calculations with painters about their income. They expect to be, in the majority of cases, out of work for two, or three, or four months, and their wages, if the average is taken for the whole year, amount to seldom less than 20 s. a week.

1367. If out-door relief is freely given, or in such a manner as to lead to this class taking advantage of it widely, the result must be one of these two things, either that they will squander all their higher wages during the time that they are employed, or that their wages will be reduced because it will be known that they will be supported from other funds in the winter?
Unquestionably; I think it is absolutely certain that these results would be produced.

1368. So that the consequences would be fatal to the welfare of that class of men themselves?
I am entirely persuaded that that is so.

1369. Are the guardians elected annually in Marylebone?
Yes.

1370. Has it been the case that the board has often been very largely changed?
No.

1371. Should you think it an advantage if only one-third of the board went out each year?
It would not be the least advantage in Marylebone.

1372. Lord Thrimg.] Because there is continuity?
Exactly so.

1373. Earl of Strafford.] Who is the chairman of the board of guardians in Marylebone?
Mr. Boulnois, an able and respected man.

1374. Lord Thrimg.] Do you approve of a continuity of guardians, either practical or legal?
I think it is most important.

1375. Chairman.] Have you anything further to add to the evidence which you have already given the Committee?
There is a point, of no very great importance, but which perhaps I might be allowed to mention. In my belief it is very much better to give relief in money
money than to give it in kind. There is always a very strong *prima facie* impression in favour of giving relief in kind. The same principle applies to charity as to the Poor Law, and I have noticed that there is much greater carelessness in giving relief when the relief is given in kind, or by tickets, than when it is given in money. There is a fallacious dependence upon tickets, or upon kind, as securing that the money shall not be wasted in the public-house, for example; and that causes the guardians, and still more private persons, to give much more carelessly than they otherwise would. Many years ago, I suggested, in a lecture which was printed, two rules for giving; one, always to give in money rather than in kind, and another not to give less than half a crown; and I believe that those who give a decent sum in money are far more likely to be considerate as to what they give than if they gave it in kind. They are likely to give a very insignificant amount in kind, which is of no value whatever, and they give it without regard, or with very little regard, to character; whilst tickets can be negotiated for alcoholic drinks just as well as money.

1376. Do you think that when out-door relief is given, it would be desirable that it should be so small in amount that in effect it would be sufficient for support, so that the receiver should be compelled to eke it out by doing a certain amount of work?

I think not. I think it is a bad principle to give very small amounts in out-door relief.

1377. It is, in your opinion, better, if a man is really destitute, to give him sufficient really to support himself?

I think so.

1378. Earl of Milltown.] The reason why you prefer relief to be given in money rather than in kind is that it causes the donor of the relief to be more careful of the way in which it is given?

That is my belief.

1379. Not from any effect on the recipient?

Yes, I think if they are decent people relief in money is far less humiliating to them than relief in kind. I feel that it is a sort of insult to respectable persons to assume that they cannot spend money properly; so that I think it is important, for the self-respect of those who receive as well as for the sake of care in those who give, that the relief should be given in money.

1380. At the same time, do you not think that if they wanted to make an improper use of the relief it is much easier to spend the money which they receive in an improper manner than to go to all the trouble to turn the relief in kind into money before they can spend it?

It may be somewhat easier; but the safer course is not to give anything to persons who cannot be trusted with money.

1381. Chairman.] Would you object to relief being given in kind where by giving it in kind the provisions or the articles which are given can be procured both more cheaply and of better quality than they can be procured by the recipient himself?

That would be a small argument, if the case were so.

1382. Could you not, for example, buy a great many articles a great deal cheaper and of the same quality than a poor man who buys a very small amount at a small retail shop?

There might be some little economy in that way, but I should not allow that to outweigh the general reason with me.

1383. Lord Thriving.] You do not apply your remarks to small sick comforts, I presume?

No.

1384. Lord
1384. Lord Balfour.] We were told that in Manchester the guardians had set up a store of their own, and that in so far as they gave relief in kind, they gave it from that store upon orders from the relieving officer; have you ever had experience of such a system as that?

No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, at Twelve o’clock.
Die Jovis, 3 Maii, 1888.
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Mr. ALBERT PELL, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

1385. Chairman.] You were for some years a Member of the House of Commons, and took an interest and an active part in legislation relating to Poor Law matters, and you also, I understand, have acted as a guardian altogether for no less than 46 years?

Yes, ever since I was of age.

1386. And for over 30 years you have been guardian of the Brixworth Union in Northamptonshire, and have been for many years guardian nominated by the Local Government Board for the Union of St. George’s-in-the-East, in London?

Yes. I believe I ought to describe St. George’s-in-the-East as a parish, because there are no other parishes united with it.

1387. You were also for a number of years a nominated member of the Metropolitan Asylums Board?

Yes.

1388. Besides which, you have been Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Mansion House Council on Metropolitan Poverty, and have taken part in many other matters relating to the Poor Law questions?

Yes; I was Chairman of the Executive Committee in the winter of 1886-87, in which year the Council was appointed to consider the distress in the metropolis, or rather the poverty of the metropolis.

1389. In what year were you first a guardian of St. George’s-in-the-East?

I should think it must have been about 1875; I am not quite clear about it.

1390. Till what year?

I retired the other day; I found I could not very well go on with the work regularly.

1391. Can you tell us what is the difference between the state of things which you found in St. George’s-in-the-East and that in which you left it, as regards the relief of the poor?

(70.)

When
When I joined the Board, the reform had been commenced in St. George's in-the-East, and the principles upon which the reform was to be carried out were, I think, accepted by nearly all the members of the Board; there were a few exceptions, but there was a very strong majority in favour of carrying out the principles as they have been laid down and explained by my colleague, whom I believe your Lordships are going to examine, Mr. A. G. Crowder; and, although there was some little contention over particular cases, I do not think that I can call to mind any departure in practice from the principles that had been laid down as those we should follow.

1392. I find here in the latest return the population of St. George's in-the-East is 47,167 (this is the latest return from the Local Government Board for the 1st of January 1888), the number of in-door paupers, 1,361, being a ratio of 1,000 of the population of 28:9; the out-door is only 237 (excluding lunatics and vagrants, being a ratio per 1,000 of 5, in a total of 1,598. These are the mean numbers on the 1st of July 1887 and the 1st of January 1888, and the total ratio per 1,000 of population is 33:9, the total for London being 24:2. That would show that notwithstanding the strict administration of the law, St. George's in-the-East contains still a number of paupers much in excess of the average of London. I suppose that that arises from the nature of the population, which is a very poor one?

The nature of the population is a very poor and a very foreign one. We have to relieve all the destitute poor that come in foreign ships into the London Docks.

1393. Have you any figures which would show us what the numbers were when first became guardian?

No; I thought those could be obtained from the Local Government Board.

1394. Was there any labour yard in St. George's in-the-East when you first became guardian?

I think there was when I first joined; there is none now.

1395. Was this restriction of out-door relief carried into effect gradually, or was there anything like a sudden change made?

I should call it a sudden change. Of course some little time was taken; but the drop in the relief to the out-door poor was, to my mind, very rapid.

1396. Did you find that that caused any discontent amongst the poor population of the parish?

I do not think it caused any discontent among them, as far as it can be measured by the votes of the electors in electing the guardians. Perhaps I might state a singular thing with regard to the feelings of the people in the part of London, with reference to out-door relief. I think in 1879 there was an address issued upon the election of the guardians, who are there elected for three years (it was extremely moderate, and therefore very dangerous), stating that, though upon the whole the persons who published this address believed that the administration of the Poor Law strictly by the guardians of St. George's in-the-East had worked well, the people must know that there were hard cases which ought to be dealt with in an exceptional manner, and therefore they hoped that so-and-so would be returned. I think there were six gentlemen proposed as guardians, three of them being old guardians, and three of them being new persons. Well, we met that as you would meet a Parliamentary election, in a very open way, by contesting the statement as to hard cases, and by canvassing the parish on behalf of candidates on our principles. Not one of these gentlemen got in who had advocated a change in this very moderate way; every one of them were rejected.

1397. In what year was that?

I think it was about the year 1879. I was away in America at the time the election took place, but I supported the canvass on the other side. The election had to be fought in a systematic way.

1398. And
1398. And the population by that time had had full means of knowing the regulations under which the guardians acted, and of estimating the result?

Yes.

1399. So that it was a fair test of the opinions of the population?

I think a very fair test; the test of experience.

1400. Could you tell me to what class of cases the remaining out-door cases would belong?

I do not think that there were when I left (and certainly they are not increased) above 20 or 30 cases; and judging of the recipients when they come into the Board-room, which we require them to do once a year to know that they are living, they are well-to-do people; they are old, but they come in well dressed, and with very good manners, and with no appearance of living in a squalid or uncomfortable manner; in fact, if they lived in unsuitable homes, even any old cases, the relief would be discontinued.

1401. On what ground did you make an exception from your general rule of only giving relief in the workhouse?

Perhaps it was out of consideration to the weakness of human nature. It might have hurt our cause to have taken these people off.

1402. But these cases, I rather gathered from your answer, were mostly old cases?

Yes, they had been on for some time; certainly, I should think, for 12 or 13 years.

1403. Now, when new cases presented themselves, did you sometimes grant out-door relief?

Never; I cannot call to mind that in any case since I have been a guardian of St. George’s-in-the-East we have granted out-of-door relief, in the ordinary sense of the word. Of course, if a man breaks his leg, and he is carried into his lodgings, wherever it may be, he is attended there by our out-door doctor. If he dies in his home or is too much shattered to be carried to the infirmary, it becomes an out-of-door case, though it may be only for a few hours.

1404. But in any case, if the illness was such that the doctor certified that it was not safe to carry him further than his lodgings, the relief would have to be administered as out-door relief?

Yes, if the person was irremovable; but those cases are extremely rare.

1405. Supposing, for instance, a man was suffering from very severe bronchitis?

He would be removed into the infirmary.

1406. Did your doctor always allow a case of bronchitis to be removed?

In a case of bronchitis the man would be removed unless it would be fatal to do so.

1407. But you would be guided by the report of your medical officer?

He might report as he liked; we should follow our own judgment.

1408. If he reported that it would be dangerous to the man’s life to be removed from the lodging in which he was, would the guardians take the responsibility of removing him?

I do not think we should in that case; but I cannot call to mind that the doctor ever made such a report.

1409. Are the people in St. George’s-in-the-East so hardy that they can always be removed when they have illnesses?

I do not say always. But supposing I was a poor person in St. George’s-in-the-East suffering from bronchitis, I should prefer being removed to our infirmary to being left with the best doctor in those miserable homes; the chance of life would be better by removal, and the doctor would know very little of the treatment of such cases in the infirmary if he was to desire to keep his patients in such homes, when close by (because the parish covers a very small area) there is an estab-
lishment properly warmed, and properly built, and with every sort of appliances, trained hospital nurses, and two medical men resident under the roof of the building in which the patient would be placed.

1410. In point of fact, from the nature of the locality and the provision which there is made for all sick persons, practically you very rarely indeed were not able to move these persons to the infirmary?

Practically very seldom, certainly.

1411. Then if the present system is continued, the time will come when practically there will be no out-door relief?

Practically no out-of-door relief.

1412. Did you deal in any special way with the case of widows with children?

Yes: an able-bodied widow in the parish of St. George’s-in-the-East is supposed to be able to maintain two children. If she has more than two children, those in excess of that number, if she desires it, and there is no charitable assistance to help her in any other way, are taken down to our schools at Plashet, where they are kept till either the woman can maintain them herself or marries again, or some opening in life presents itself for their being placed out. I might here say that I have never in my experience in St. George’s-in-the-East, certainly in the last seven or eight years, heard a widow apply for out-of-door relief. The spirit in which a poor woman came before the Board is more one of inquiry of the guardians what she had better do; the question will be put, “Which child do you think I had better keep, sir, Mary or John?” and so on; and we give her an answer according to the best of our judgment, and advise her in the way that we think will give her the best opportunities for coming round in the world. But I have never, certainly of late years, seen a widow coming into the room with tears and behaving in the way they usually do in country unions when asking for out-of-door relief.

1413. But they ask for relief in the form of a certain number of children being taken from them and placed in your schools?

Yes, at Plashet; our school in the country, with a farm attached.

1414. Had you ever cases of widows who declined to part with their children, and therefore had to be otherwise dealt with?

No, never. I might say here, perhaps, as we are still upon the case of the widows, that another thing happens when a widow comes into the Board-room in St. George’s-in-the-East. We ask her a few questions as to what her husband was, who he worked for, whether she can say that he had any claim in the nature of faithful service upon the old master; and if we find that to be the case, or if we think that the woman should, if it was possible, be kept altogether from the taint of pauperism, she is requested to go to the local Committee of the Charity Organisation Society, where her case is inquired into, and the master is communicated with; and to the honour of the London masters I must say that in many cases we find they are ready to assist.

1415. If on inquiry the widow does not turn out to be a respectable person, or one who has any reasonable claim, in your opinion, upon charity, you would offer her the house, I suppose?

Some go into the house.

1416. In those cases that I specified she would be offered the house?

There would be no other offer of poor relief for the woman but the house, or to part with the children, and let the children go down to our schools, and then (I am talking of an able-bodied woman, a woman able to maintain herself) she is left out of doors in her home, such as it is, with two children.

1417. You assume that an able-bodied widow may support two children; that would be subject, would it not, to examination in detail; because it might happen, I suppose, that some women would not be able to support two; in that case you would deal with the application accordingly?

I cannot
I cannot say whether we have ever left a woman with less than one child out; there may be cases.

1418. But if she persevered in asserting that she could not support the two children, you would then offer her the workhouse?

She would have to come into the workhouse. As far as my experience goes, the circumstances of these women are better, I think, in St. George's, owing very much to the destruction of trades that were kept up by out-of-door relief. I do not think the sweaters can do much in St. George's-in-the-East. There were people who used to work at felling military trousers, for which, I believe, 10 d. used to be the price, but the St. George's women declined to work for 10 d.; they would stick out for 1 s., because they got no out-of-door relief, and I think the work passed away elsewhere; I think there is very little tailoring work done now in St. George's. This work has been replaced a good deal by sack-making, which is harder, and is conducted out of doors; the women put their sack to a hook in the wall and draw away; it is better paid, and, I think, more healthy work.

1419. In your opinion, the system of giving small doles to widows only results in lowering the rate of wages?

I think that for every penny you give in out-of-door relief you take away twopence from the wages.

1420. So that, so far from being a benefit to the working classes, it is a direct injury?

A direct and positive money injury, apart from the moral one, which is more serious still.

1421. And I need hardly ask you whether you think that it is beneficial to the ratepayers; because it is clear that the system pursued tends to diminish the total rate?

Out-of-door relief is certainly not beneficial to the ratepayers.

1422. So that you think there is no class of society that is not injured by the system of out-door relief?

No class; and possibly the moral fibre of the upper orders is suffering more from the giving of out-of-door relief than that of the lower; because they appear to me to consider that they are discharged from the obligation of helping their neighbours personally, and by personal sacrifice.

1423. Let me take the case of a widow who is sickly and not able to support any children; how would you deal with that case?

She would have to come in the house; but the normal condition of the human being is not sickliness.

1424. But there are cases such as I have referred to?

Then you come to exceptional cases; and we have heard that exceptional cases make bad law, and make bad practice. I think, in St. George's, such a case as that would probably get charitable assistance.

1425. I will come to that presently; I have been dealing hitherto with the relief from poor rates. Now, referring to these, what I may term exceptional or hard cases, were they dealt with in St. George's-in-the-East by means of charitable organisations in the parish?

The actual cases.

1426. Yes, the actual cases?

I do not think that the Charity Organisation Society has distributed much money in St. George's-in-the-East.

1427. But I understood it to be your practice that, if a case came before the guardians which, upon an investigation, you thought was one for charity, that the case was not one for relief out of the house, you would refer it to the Charity Organisation Society?

Yes, to the district committee of the Charity Organisation Society for inquiry.
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1428. Do
1428. Do you regard that as a very important supplementary means of dealing with the poor?
Yes, I do; I think that has smoothed our action very considerably.

1429. Do you think that it would be possible to persevere in a system of refusing out-door relief, without some supplementary system of charity which could deal with such cases as I have referred to?
It might be possible, but the other is the easier plan of carrying out a reform some agency behind which will relieve the weak-minded guards from the sense of discomfort produced by the feeling that a person may go away without relief. A weak-minded guardian, who is afraid of putting the Poor Law in force strictly, if he is told, "But you know, if this is not a really bad case, it will be helped in some way or other," passes it over and leaves it to the agency or the person who has made that statement to him, and often forgets all about it afterwards.

1430. Independently of the outlet which may thus be afforded for dealing with those whom you have termed weak-minded, do you think, as a matter of principle, it is desirable, in the interests of the poor and the interests of the whole community, that there should be charitable organisations which should take up and deal with these cases?
I think the province of the Poor Law is entirely distinct from the province of charity. The one, the Poor Law, is being charitable by proxy. As far as charitable people make use of the Poor Law for relief, it is being charitable by proxy, and not really being charitable at all.

1431. I do not think that you have quite followed my question. I meant to ask whether you thought it was beneficial to the community that there should be such organisations as the Charity Organisation Society, or other similar organisations, in every part of the kingdom, which should deal with cases which do not fairly come within the principles on which you would administer relief under the Poor Law?
Am I to understand that your Lordship means, is it desirable that that should be provided by law?

1432. No; whether you think it is a desirable thing in itself?
I think it is, in London undoubtedly, where we know so little of our neighbours.

1433. And where there are such societies, would you be in favour with their being in direct communication with the boards of guardians and the relieving officers?
Certainly, or else you may have cross assistance. You may have a charitable association, helping the case, and the relieving officer knowing nothing at all about it, and the relieving officer continuing assistance or recommending assistance out of doors. That could not possibly happen with us in St. George's-in-the-East, because there is nothing but indoor relief.

1434. If the system which is pursued in St. George's-in-the-East were generally pursued throughout the country, and there were also charitable organisations, established for the purpose of dealing with cases which the Poor Law did not reach, did it ever occur to you whether the result might not be demoralisation of the poor by means of the charitable organisation, which might not be administered on business principles, and might lead to, in fact, the same result as indiscriminate out-door relief?
I quite agree with you. I think that with regard to any charity by a society or an organisation there is always a certain danger about it; it can never be so safe as individual and personal charity. Nothing can approach that to my mind, when it is given reasonably, and with care, and sufficiently.

1435. What I had in my mind was not a merely charitable association, acting as it were independently, but one which was in close connection with, though not forming a part of, the system of poor relief; and I should like to ask you whether you do not think that, if that system was general, it might come to this, that the poor would come to regard themselves as having a kind of right to go to these charitable associations?
I think
I think that would be mischievous. The primary intention of the Charity Organisation Society (I am a member of two, one in London and one in the country) was inquiry. It has got into receiving relief from persons to apply to special cases, which is getting as near as you can to individual and personal charity.

1436. I should like on this point to ask you a question as to the practice in the Brixworth Union, where the out-door relief, as I gather from a statement I have seen, has been reduced to a minimum. It is very low.

1437. I should like to ask you whether you have any organised system of charity of a special kind in that union.

The nearest approach to it is this, that there is a small fund: I do not think it exceeds 25l. a year, that is subscribed by four or five persons resident in the union, which fund is administered upon the same principles, or as nearly as we can follow them, which govern the Tower Hamlets Pension Society, a copy of whose rules I sent your Lordship.

1438. The pension society to which you just now referred is the "Tower Hamlets Pension Committee for the provident poor of the East of London, in unions where the practice of giving Out-door Relief is being abolished"?

Yes. Your Lordship perhaps will observe that in the 5th rule, at page 7, we state, "That the object of the committee being to meet the difficulties of a period of transition" (it is only for a period of transition), "no pension be granted to persons who had not attained their 40th birthday on the 1st of January 1872"; so that, in the course of time, we hope that we may disappear as an association for this form of relief in the East of London, because we shall get to a period when we shall have no persons presenting themselves to us who had attained their 40th birthday on the 1st January 1872. I am the chairman of the committee. The first question that is put to the applicant is, "What parish do you belong to?" (we only can pretend to assist persons coming from three parishes, that is, Stepney, Whitechapel, and St. George's-in-the-East; those being the only three parishes in the East of London which have abolished out-door relief); and then, "What is your age?" And, if the person does not fall within the 5th rule, or comes from a parish where out-door relief is given, we say at once, "We cannot consider your case." But these rules, such as they are, those who concern themselves about this little fund in the Brixworth Union, have seen and follow as closely as they can, with the exception of those that apply particularly to London.

1439. Earl Spencer.] In the Brixworth Union, the fund to which you refer does not deal with pensions exclusively, does it?

No, it is not pensions; virtually we should go on, I think, giving as long as the person was in the same condition; but in the country the case frequently gets removed out of our hands, or some other assistance is given locally.

1440. There is a great deal of temporary relief?

A great deal of temporary relief; it is much more temporary in the country, and in Brixworth, than it is in the case of the Tower Hamlets Pension Committee. To show your Lordships' Committee how effective a comparatively small sum may be, I may say that I think last year we had only something like 24 cases (I will not be sure, but really a very small number of cases) that had fallen within the rules of the Tower Hamlets Pension Committee. There is very nearly a quarter of a million of people that have come under us, and I think our income is only 280l., or something under 300 l. a year, and we find that that meets the cases; we have never pressed the public for assistance.

1441. Chairman.] Does the board of guardians ever refer cases to that committee?

No, we should not have any cases direct from them. The operation of this committee is rather singular in one way; all expenses of working are paid by the committee, anything that is given goes entirely free from any charge (70.)
whatever to the poor, and the cases are inquired into by the gentlemen
whose names you will see upon the first page as forming the committee.
I have not been as good an attendant as I ought to have been, because
I live now almost entirely in the country; but if a case came before us
it might be my duty to take a cab and go and see the home of the person, and
ascertain whether all that had been told us had been correct.

1442. I find here, at page 9, a statement (in Extracts from the first Report,
1878), which I will read to you. It says that the paragraph is part of a report
recently furnished to a charitable society by one of its committees; and it is as
follows: “The committee must in the first instance premise that they do not
believe deserving chronic cases to be of frequent occurrence; that is, supposing
the term ‘deserving to mean, deserving to be kept out of the workhouse.’
They believe that, except in rare instances, it is best for the poor that all
should go into the workhouse, who, when old age comes upon them have no
means for their support, and no friends able or willing to provide for them.
The reason for this belief is the absolutely certain truth that the labouring
classes of this country will never apply themselves, as it is essential to their pro-
gress and happiness they should apply themselves, to the task of providing for
old age, so long as any agency, whether public or private, exists, that will enable
them to live outside the workhouse walls. On the other hand, it is scarcely less
certain that, if they know the workhouse to be the only refuge for destitute old
age, they will make strenuous, salutary, and probably successful efforts to provide
for themselves.” Does that clearly delineate the position taken up by the
Tower Hamlets Committee?

Yes, I think it does. The point is that we do not help persons who are out-
without friends and whose relations are not doing what they can, however little it
is, if only 1 d. a month, to assist.

1443. You speak of 1 d. a month; in St. George’s-in-the-East were efforts
made to require relatives who were able to support their destitute relations, to
fulfil their legal obligations; did the guardians make successful efforts to cause
the relations of paupers to contribute?

Yes, they prosecute where a relation legally bound to assist fails to do it.

1444. But did you find that you were able to succeed in a great number of
cases?

In some cases. I do not think in a very great number; we have a return of
the number. But I hope your Lordship does not think we should be satisfied
with 1 d.

1445. What is the smallest contribution which the guardians would receive
in St. George’s-in-the-East?

It would depend entirely upon the condition of the person who was paying it.

1446. What would be the smallest?

They might be satisfied with 1 s. a week.

1447. And in the Brixworth Union do you go lower than that?

No, I do not think that we do go lower than 1 s.

1448. To go to another matter; what was the practice with regard to medical
attendance and relief in St. George’s-in-the-East; had you any special dispensa-
dary, or how was that conducted?

There is a dispensary, not under the roof of the workhouse, but the opposite
side of the street; there is a dispensary for the furnishing of medicine that may
be ordered by the out-door medical officer for the time being, whatever it may
be.

1449. Did your out-door medical officers attend many cases?

They used to attend a vast number.

1450. But now?

Now very few. Perhaps I may be thought to be damaging my case, but I
should like to be open on the subject. We have had our relieving officer tried
for manslaughter in St. George’s-in-the-East.

1451. Was
1451. Was he acquitted?

Oh, dear, yes. It was a curious case, but it illustrates these medical orders. A woman applied to the relieving officer for assistance during her sickness, and he visited her, as he was bound to do, immediately. She asked for medical relief, and the officer refused it. He said, "First of all your husband is close at hand, and it is not right that I should step between you and your husband; secondly, you have means of living, on the table and in the cupboard by you; thirdly, you were in the infirmary of the workhouse only yesterday or the day before" (a very short time before), "and against the advice of the doctor and against the advice of the authorities, you removed yourself and came out into this miserable room which you are now in." He refused the order, and the woman died, I think, the next day. There was a coroner's inquest, and, contrary to the recommendation of the coroner, the jury insisted in bringing in a verdict of manslaughter against the relieving officer. That was not a very nice thing to have in a parish where we were attempting to carry out this sort of reform. The man was tried for it; I forget whether the judge told the jury or not that there was no case, or whether he charged them that it was not a case of manslaughter, but it was over in a very short time (it was reported in the newspapers), and the man was discharged. But it frightened our medical officers, and it led to a practice among them, which had been discontinued for very many years, of establishing what we call technically, nourishment cases. A doctor goes and sees a person (he is sent for very likely by the relieving officer) who is in an extremely poor condition, and the doctor recommends that milk should be furnished (it is generally milk; sometimes beef tea, or something of that sort), and the relieving officer furnishes it. But those cases are now disappearing again. They are getting bolder; the verdict of the coroner's jury and the trial of the relieving officer took place more than a year ago now, and the effect is passing away.

1452. I suppose where such an order is given by a medical officer, it would depend upon whether the guardians were of opinion that the pauper could provide it for himself, whether the nourishment was given; it would not be given as a matter of course?

Of course, as your Lordship knows very well, no medical officer can give an order at all; he can only recommend.

1453. I am aware of that; but you would not consider yourselves bound, because the medical officer had been allowed to attend the pauper, to give the further assistance of the nourishment which he might recommend?

No, we should not. We met the case by having the two out-of-door doctors appear before us every evening that we met (we meet at three in the afternoon in St. George's-in-the-East), and there we questioned them very closely as to why the nourishment was wanted, and so on.

1454. But even if it was wanted, if you thought the persons could provide it for themselves, you would decline to provide it?

We certainly should; but we relaxed our practice for a time in extreme cases, because we are obliged to bend to a certain extent to public feeling and impulses.

1455. Did you find that the poor had recourse largely to your infirmary?

I think they are becoming more ready to go into it; they appear to draw a distinction between the infirmary and the workhouse. Of course it is the workhouse, though as you know in London the infirmary must not be connected even by a door with the workhouse. Our infirmary is side by side with the workhouse; it is a very much larger building than the workhouse, and the door opens separately into the street. Technically speaking, all persons coming through the infirmary pass through the books as in-door paupers, though they may never see the inside of the workhouse.

1456. Do you think that they regard the infirmary with less dislike than the workhouse?

(Y) Yes,
Yes, I do, and I think the feeling is increasing; so much so that, if I might suggest it, I think it would be desirable that when they leave the infirmary, and their friends come for them, they should pass out through the workhouse.

1457. Might not the tendency be, if they were made first-rate hospitals, that they might take the place of hospitals? I consider the infirmary of St. George's in-the-East to be as perfect in its way as any hospital in London; I am a governor of Guy's Hospital. One of the first effects of reform in St. George's in-the-East was to aim at a higher and better treatment of the sick paupers. We dismissed, for instance, all pauper attendants; the infirmary nurses in our union are trained nurses, and there are two hospital medical men resident under the roof of the infirmary. Of course we cannot have as skilled men as you have in the London hospitals. Perhaps you would allow me to say how we deal with the intricate, what the medical men call interesting, cases in St. George's in-the-East. The Board used to subscribe very largely to the London Hospital. We do not think that the London Hospital is really helping the condition of the people on in the east of London, but rather the reverse.

1458. To what particular hospital did the poor mostly go from St. George's in-the-East? The London Hospital; it is not far from it, in the Whitechapel-road. We therefore withdrew the annual subscription. I think it was over 200 l. a year, but we withdrew it altogether, and then we said to the hospital, "We are quite aware that there are cases such as ovarian disorders and diseases of the eye and brain, intricate cases that we could not deal with as they ought to be dealt with in our infirmary; we will give so much a case to take these in." Now the surprising thing to me was that those who manage the London Hospital took them in for very much less, I am certain, than they could be treated for, and side by side with that was an appeal going out to the public for enlarged assistance to the London Hospital. There were we, ready to give more; the guardians of St. George's in-the-East, I might almost say, have subsequently insisted in giving more, for we do give more now to the individual cases, though I doubt now whether we give enough. I have mentioned this because I want to point out to your Lordships' Committee that we have not forgotten in the care of the indoor poor the dealing with the most intricate surgical cases, and that they are provided for in the London Hospital, and that we are ready to pay adequately for them up to any extent if we were asked. The subscription to the London Hospital was 10 l., not 200 l.

1459. Have you formed any opinion as to the effects upon the London poor of the large charities which are, in fact, administered by the hospitals of London in the shape of medical assistance? Yes. Some years ago a few people who were interested in the subject met in London and considered the whole matter of the hospitals. We had the assistance of Sir William Gull, the late Mr. William Edward Forster, Mr. Stansfeld, and others, and we hoped then that we might have persuaded the Home Secretary to give us a Royal Commission to inquire into it; there is no doubt whatever in my mind that the London hospitals have a demoralising effect. I believe that for 200 or 300 years the poor on the other side of the water had been demoralised by St. Thomas' and Guy's Hospital. Out of every 1,000 persons that we relieve in Guy's Hospital, 600 come from within a radius of two miles. Now, conceive the effect of a large hospital, intended by Thomas Guy for the benefit of the whole of England, and the wards and rooms filled by people, 600 out of every 1,000 of whom are residing within two miles.

1460. Would you explain a little more fully in what way you think that this demoralising effect has been produced? I can do that, I think, pretty clearly by comparing the way in which a case, as far as relief goes, would be treated by the governors of the London Hospital and by the guardians of St. George's in-the-East. A man would present himself before us with a broken arm; we should say, "What are you?" "I am a fitter, or a rigger," or whatever he may be. We do not ask him what his wages are; we perfectly well know what the wages are, and we do not
not tempt him to lies by asking him, "What are you earning?" we know what he ought to earn. We say, "We can deal with you, but we must make it a condition of treating you surgically that you should pay something for this when you go out of the workhouse." The man might make use of some very coarse expression to us, and walk out of the room. He goes straight to the London Hospital, where he gets treated for nothing. Another man will come in in exactly the same condition, and he will say, "Gentlemen, I am much obliged to you; I will go into the infirmary;" and if it is only 2 d. or 6 d. a week, we endeavour to get it from him. But the man who has been in the London Hospital with the first 2 d. he gets he goes to the public-house. In the infirmary in St. George's-in-the-East the man knows we have a claim upon him, and that we shall enforce the claim if we are able to do so. I say that we are better friends to the poor in St. George's-in-the-East with such rules, than the governors of the London Hospital are without such rules.

1461. That is a system of loans, in fact?
Yes.

1462. Supposing that system could be generally established, and that there were no hospitals to which a man could go, where a system of loans was not in force, how, in point of fact, could you then deal with cases of severe accident; could you wait till a man agreed to pay so much?
No; but what I should like to see is that the opportunity was given for a man with some self-respect to pay for, or contribute something towards, his treatment. In Guy's Hospital, since I have been a governor, that has been established. We receive patients at a guinea a week in the common ward, and 3 guineas a week in cubicles. The poor law, I think one might say, is better administered in London than elsewhere in England, and I think it is having a moral effect upon the people. I was at Guy's Hospital myself yesterday, with Dr. Steele, the medical superintendent. He told me that last year the payments made by patients in the hospitals in London for medical assistance amounted to something over 38,000 l., and it exceeded by a few hundred pounds the money which had been collected on the Sundays in the churches for the Hospital Fund.

1463. Earl Spencer.] And in the streets?
No, not in the streets; that which is collected in the streets comes to a very large amount.

1464. Chairman.] I think your view would be that as regards giving relief in hospitals, the same way as giving relief in parish infirmaries, every one who is able to contribute towards the expense ought to be made to contribute?
Certainly.

1465. And that the gratuitous assistance should be reserved for those who are really unable to pay?
Yes; unless they submit their persons to surgical examinations of a very critical nature, which I consider is equivalent to payment in money. The School of Medicine and Surgery advancing in Guy's Hospital, could not advance without cases of that nature; they do make some return to the society by illustrating medical teaching.

1466. How do you deal in St. George's-in-the-East with casual poor?
The casual poor are taken into the ordinary casual ward (we have no labour ward), and there they are well treated, and are detained under the Casual Poor Act, which I got through Parliament.

1467. Then you did not pursue the plan which we have been informed is pursued in Stepney, of admitting all casual poor whom you thought it necessary to relieve, into the workhouse?
No, I should be pleased myself to see the distinction abolished between the casual poor and the ordinary poor; I think it is a mischievous distinction; and I endeavoured,
I endeavoured, when the Casual Poor Bill was first drafted, to put that in; but I should have had no chance of getting it through the House, so I contented myself with the detention.

1468. Would you be in favour of abolishing the distinction throughout the country?

I think it is a very pitiable sight to see the casuals coming out on a cold morning, rather more pitiable in the country than in London, apart from all considerations of their character; they are badly clothed and they are blue with cold before they have been out in the road ten minutes. Surely it is not a desirable thing to permit that form of relief to any of our fellow creatures. By the old law they were detained to nine o'clock till they had no chance of getting work. The Act which I brought in permits them to get out early now and to get a chance of work.

1469. But there is a large class of vagrants or casual poor who do not work and who do not desire to work; what do you think would be the result of dealing with them in the same mode as with other paupers; do you think it would tend to increase the class or diminish it?

Your Lordship will observe one of the first things that would happen. Supposing the casual poor were put upon the same footing as the ordinary poor, they would go into the workhouse, and there would be an inquiry into the settlement. It is contended that there is a great influx of the casual poor into London from the country. If that be true, while there is no inquiry into the settlement of the casual, he might be asked by the detective officer, "Did you sleep in a casual ward the other end of London last night?" but that is the only question; but if he were put into the workhouse, and came for relief in the way that an ordinary pauper does, there he would be an inquiry into his settlement, and he would be sent back to it, and London would have to disgorge some of these casuals, if it is true that there is a sort of periodical influx of these people in winter. Judging from my own experience, I do not think there is much of that. I go into the casual wards sometimes, and the people do not appear to me to have anything to do with the country. The whole of the metropolis under Mr. Gathorne Hardy's Act is treated as one parish for the casual poor; and if an officer found a casual in St. George's-in-the-East casual ward, whom he knew from inquiry to have been sleeping at Kensington the night before, that casual would be liable to be punished. I think that would be so if it happened in the same week, but I will be sure about it.

1470. Now to follow up that matter, seeing that a very large number of these casual poor are not poor who come from other districts, still I suppose it would be the case that there would be a great many of the casual poor whose settlement would not be in London?

Not many now. The derivative settlement is so limited; with the three years' residence the derivative settlement is almost abolished; a man who has been one year is irremovable, and three years confers a settlement; so that if he has been three years in London he would get his settlement.

1471. Now you gave it as your opinion that it would be desirable to abolish the distinction between casuals and ordinary paupers throughout the country; what would be the effect upon men passing through the country, if in every case their settlement was inquired into and they were removed to the place of settlement; would not that cause a great deal of hardship and discontent?

The first effect would be that you would have fewer of this class of people passing through the country. I suppose the vulgar idea is that a good many of these people are artisans seeking work. But that is not the case. The great trades unions pass their men themselves; they know where the work is wanted and they pass their men to it. These as a rule are professional wanderers making their way up to races, and to the Mansion House Fund in winter.

1472. Besides what may be termed professional beggars there are a considerable number of people who live by chance employment, as you say, at races, or
at the sea-side, or hop picking, or in various other ways where employment is only to be found in certain places for a short time in the year. Now would it be endurable that any person whatsoever who was passing through the country for the purpose of going to some sea-side place or to race-course or hop picking, and who happened to be without any means and to require a lodging, should have to be passed back to his place of settlement?

I think it would be. If the men passing through the country are wanted, we will say at Brighton, there is somebody who wants them, and, to my mind, the persons who want them had better supply them with the means of reaching Brighton. It is so obvious to me that these men are merely a sort of parasites wandering about the country living very much upon the pittances given them by the poor; I think the poor are the principal people now who maintain them.

1473. But do not you think that there are a certain number in the country of what can be termed bond fide wayfarers who are in need of lodging and shelter?

Undoubtedly.

1474. Could you, having regard to those cases, enact a law which would result in any wayfarer who applied for a lodging and shelter for a night being removed back to his place of settlement?

A wayfarer who was destitute, who had got nothing, do you mean?

1475. Who was without the means of obtaining lodging and shelter for the night, and therefore had to apply to the workhouse. Do you think it would be possible to enforce a law which would empower a board of guardians to remove all such men to their place of settlement?

I should not desire to see such a law passed, because I should desire myself to get rid of the law of settlement altogether. I have expressed that opinion over and over again in Parliament.

1476. If you got rid of the law of settlement, that difficulty, which I have just been putting to you, would disappear?

I hope that day will come.

1477. But without that do you not think it would be very hazardous to attempt such a law?

It might be. But to illustrate these cases, I may say that I have known a master censured for doing this with a tramp in an adjoining union, who presented himself with a basket of tools on his back, with a good plane and a good saw; I daresay the basketful was worth a sovereign. The master said, "I will not take you in; go into the town to a lodging house, and sell your tools." That master was censured by the board of guardians. On this subject I may mention the following incident: I was passing along the high road in Northamptonshire; it was one of the nights that I had been out making inquiries into the condition of these out-door paupers in Brixworth Union; it was when the reform was commenced, and a man hailed me in the dark and said, "Governor, can you tell me where I can get a lodging and some help?" I said "Well, I do not know; but if you go back half-a-mile there is a village; the road will take you into the village, and the second house is a tailor's, who is receiving out-door parish relief, and perhaps he can take you in." "Oh," the man says to me, "I know that sort; three-quarters of them do not want it, and the other quarter do not deserve it."

1478. Whilst you were a guardian, had you any exceptional distress in the winter; were a number of able-bodied men thrown out of work at one time?

No; but in 1866, when the shipbuilding was abandoned under the Thames Shipbuilding Company, and Dudgeon's Yard closed, too, I think, I had 6,000 l. put into my hands by certain good people, one or two families in London, to apply to the emigration of persons who were really proper cases to emigrate; and then I had a very considerable experience of the destitution caused by the
breaking up of a great industry. It was certainly a very exceptional case, and a very painful one. I saw the people in a church in St. George's-in-the-East; I borrowed the church, so that I might put them in the pews, and see them one by one in the vestry. I sorted them, selected them, in this way. It took me some weeks. After I had expended the money I went down to Poplar to see this deserted district. They had been living in little buildings, imitations of villas, with little bow windows to them. Every one of these places was empty. I used to press them, "How have you gone on so long; these yards have been closed some time." One man told me he had lived for a month upon a pier glass; he had had so good a pier glass in his house that he had been able to sell it, and it was sufficient to contribute to his maintenance for some little time. That is the only instance in which I have been brought into contact with exceptional poverty in the metropolis.

1479. Were they emigrated?
Everyone of those people was emigrated.

1480. What number?
I cannot remember; they went down, about 300 people at a time, to the ship.

1481. A considerable number were emigrated?
A very considerable number. There was a very low contract made by the Allan Ship Company, who took them over.

1482. Who provided the money?
One or two families. I found no part of the money; I must say that.

1483. Do you know where they went?
To Canada. I used to say to the people, "That is the order to ship you. I have two things to ask you. I am not a teetotaller; I am desperately fond of beer myself, but don't drink on board ship; and the other thing is this: Here is an envelope; write and tell me how you go on, and if you send any money over, I will see that it helps to send some other men like you over." I never heard a word from any one of them.

1484. I suppose there never was an instance in St. George's-in-the-East in which there were a number of able-bodied men applying for relief for whom there was not room in the workhouse?
We have had to have beds made up out of the sleeping wards.

1485. But, in some way or other, you were able to provide accommodation for all that did apply?
Yes, but not proper accommodation. But we have taken care now to guard against a recurrence of that sort of thing, and we have got a very valuable piece of ground adjoining the workhouse, and built upon it; and the accommodation of the workhouse during the last two years has been much increased and improved.

1486. Have you considered in what way cases such as certainly have occurred in London and other populous towns where there is a sudden discontinuance of some class of employment, which throws a large number of men out of work, can be dealt with by the poor law?
We have in St. George's-in-the-East lost the whole of the sugar-baking industry, only one house being left, that of Martineau.

1487. But I understood you to say you have never had any case, except the one you mentioned, where several hundred persons were in one week or month thrown out of work?
No.

1488. In what way do you think that such cases should be dealt with, assuming that there are more persons applying who are in a state of destitution than the workhouse accommodation suffices for?
I am
I am afraid my evidence would not be worth much. I should like to study the subject, before I answered that question, and see how it was dealt with in Lancashire, when the cotton famine occurred. The cases are so extremely rare, of course. They occur by strikes no doubt. I do not suppose your Lordship is asking me how I would meet a strike?

1489. No, I am not?
I cannot call to mind any sudden collapse of an industry, excepting in the case of the Lancashire cotton famine, and, perhaps, when the shipbuilding on the Thames went up to the Clyde.

1490. I may take it from you, I think, that in your opinion the collapse of an industry does not, as a rule, take place with such suddenness that it is not possible to provide for it by the ordinary means?
The closing of the sugar houses was rather rapid; the industry was lost, I think, in about 15 years; I suffered from it myself; I was the freeholder of two sugar houses, both of which have been closed, one fortunately burnt down, I may say, and the other is turned into a warehouse for pickles. I am not the proprietor yet of the brick and mortar myself.

1491. You would be of opinion that there ought to be sufficient accommodation provided in every workhouse to deal with every case of exceptional distress which may reasonably be expected to occur?
I think so. I think you ought to have a little excess of accommodation. Might I say upon that point that the difference between the country and London is very remarkable. There is a great excess in your own county, my Lord, the most remarkable one of all. I think you have the union of Smallburgh. I think the accommodation in that union for in-door poor is for 800 people; it is very very large, and I do not think that they have ever much above 50 in it, or ever had. I find I have made a note of it. The house was built for 800 inmates, the population being only 17,500; and the inmates are only 64 by the last return, while the out-of-door poor are 778.

1492. That is an ordinary rural agricultural district?
I should think purely rural; I have never been in the union, but I should think purely rural.

1493. Earl Spencer.] I think you live in Brixworth Union?
Yes.

1494. Have you been elected guardian of the poor?
Yes, I have.

1495. For how long?
I think for about 10 years or more.

1496. You are, I suppose, also an ex-officio guardian?
Now I am, and have been for some years.

1497. Do you think that the action of the poor law in a country district like this may be usefully applied in towns?
Yes; I think the same principles that would lead to right administration in Brixworth would apply in London.

1498. Now we will just try and get on the notes some figures with regard to Brixworth; will you take the population of the union?
The population of the union at the last census was 13,336.

1499. That is a diminution of about 500 from 1871?
About 500 from 1871.

1500. When you first knew the union there was a very different mode of administering relief from what is done now?
Very different indeed.

1501. If we turn to 1870 will you state the number of paupers receiving out-door relief then?
(70.)
On the 1st January 1870 there were 967 cases of ordinary out-of-door relief, and 67 receiving medical attendance only, making a total of 1,034; and on the same day there were 89 in the house; making the total number of paupers, in and out, 1,123, and giving a proportion of 1 pauper to 12 of the population.

1502. And what was the proportion of indoor to outdoor paupers?
There was one pauper in the house to 11 paupers out of the house.

1503. Then a change in the administration began?
I think it was about 1872 or 1873.

1504. A most marked change began in about 1873?
Yes; 1872 was the time, I think, when we commenced the reform with a committee of inquiry, of which I have got the report somewhere here.

1505. We will go on with this table. The proportion of indoor to outdoor persons was what, then?
On the 1st January 1873 the proportion of indoor to outdoor paupers was 1 to 14, and the proportion of paupers (outdoor and indoor) to the population was 1 to 13.

1506. The change appears to have taken place in that year?
It began to take effect in that year.

1507. In July the proportion altered?
Yes.

1508. And the proportion of paupers (outdoor and indoor) to population as 1 to 21?
On the 1st of July 1873 it was 1 to 21.

1509. Then we may say generally that this change was progressive; and if we go down to, say 1887, we just get the figure you began with on the 1st January 1887
Might I observe with reference to your expression "progressive" that immediately we reduced the pauperism from 1 in 11, which it had been on the 1st January 1871, to 1 in 21, we reduced the proportion one half; it was progressive; it is true.

1510. I say, was it progressive after that?
It was.

1511. If we go down now to 1887, will you give the number receiving outdoor relief?
On the 1st July 1887, which is the last figure I have, there were only 66 persons receiving ordinary outdoor relief, not a single pauper receiving medical relief out of the house, and indoor there were 93 receiving relief; the total pauperism of the union being then (exclusive of lunatics and asylums and vagrants) 159 persons, being 1 pauper in 83 of the population, and the proportion of indoor to outdoor paupers being 14 paupers in the house to 1 pauper out of the house; and that again has been very materially reduced. The progression has gone on; the reduction of pauperism is continuing.

1512. And there has not been any addition to the outdoor relief for a very considerable time?
No. The number of paupers in the house, as stated here on the 1st July 1887, is not above an average of the last 20 years. There have been some years in which there have been fewer in the house. At the present moment, the numbers are increased by the numbers of children; I think there is one family with five or six children in it.

1513. Will you give us the cost in 1870 and the cost in 1887?
I should like to say with regard to cost (perhaps I will put it in a startling way) that if the reform continues as it is in 20 years (though that is not our motive for reform), we shall save 100,090 $ in out-of-door relief alone, as compared with 1871.

1514. We
1514. We will take the figures. If you turn to page 30, you will see them. The cost of out-door relief in 1870 was what, exclusive of wine and spirits?

The cost of the ordinary out-of-door relief for the half-year ending Lady Day 1870 (exclusive of wine and spirits) was 2,782l. (I will omit the shillings), and the indoor maintenance for the half-year was 340l. odd; the total was 3,123l., imposing a poll tax upon the inhabitants of the Union to the amount of 9s. 6d. per head.

1515. Now, take Lady Day 1887?

For the half-year ending Lady Day 1887 the cost of the out-door poor was 281l. (omitting the shillings), and the cost of the in-door poor was exactly 442l., the total cost: being 723l.; and the poll tax inflicted upon the people came to only 2s. 1d. per head of the population.

1516. That is the actual cost per head of the population?

If you had met the charge by a poll tax that would have been the tax on the inhabitants of Brixworth Poor Law Union.

1517. Now, how was this remarkable change brought about?

The thing that moved me in the first instance to it was being present at a Board, and hearing the Report and Application Book read out. They relieved then in this way: "So and so, so much relief a week until further orders," which meant almost continuous relief without inquiry. There happened to be a case that came up which attracted my attention. I asked for it to be read again. I found that relief was going into the family of a man whose children worked for me. The man said he was sickly; and I found that this relief had been given for some time, and, to my mind, in a very monstrous way; and then I inquired into some other cases, and saw how extremely bad things were: and I got a committee appointed of some of the guardians to revise the list of all the paupers in the Union, and these gentlemen met at my house. It took us a month or two to get through it, and then we made our report upon the cases, and we also presented a report of the committee, which was published by the Local Government Board, and I have it here. It appears that the committee reported on the 27th of February 1873 to the board of guardians, and we then pointed out how extravagant was the relief, and how bad the administration. We referred to the expenditure, to the amount of pauperism, to the character of the distress, to the general administration of the board; we pointed out that the house test was very rarely applied, that there was no fixed period of relief—no definite period for relief—assigned; and then we laid down these rules as being general rules for the house test, what we called "Rules invariable." We had to alter that term afterwards, and call them "Recommendations," because, technically speaking, we could not make any rules. We said that we recommended "that no out-door relief be granted in any of the following cases": First of all, "to non-residents: it being found, as a rule, that proper inspection cannot be given to such cases, and in more than one instance in the Union relief has been continued with no certain knowledge whether or not it reached its proper destination, or whether the person for whom it was intended was dead or alive." We found cases in which we had been relieving people who had been dead for some time, or finding money for their representatives. We said the other cases which we thought ought not to have out-door relief were: wives deserted by their husbands; wives or families of convicted prisoners, and single women with illegitimate children.

1518. Chairman.] Was it necessary to make any recommendation about single women with illegitimate children, because under the orders of the Poor Law Board you cannot give them out-door relief?

But the orders were violated. To give some idea of the administration, might I say that I have heard a proposition on that Board to administer relief in a distinctly illegal way made by an ex-officio guardian; and when I pointed out that it was an illegal thing to be done, the remark was, "Let us pass the law by"; and I only stopped it by insisting that the names of the guardians who voted for it should be taken down.

(70.)
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1519. Have
1519. Have you an auditor?
Yes.

1520. Does he not surcharge the guardians in such cases?
Undoubtedly he ought to do; I think there must have been cases that slipped by.

1521. Have you ever reported to the Local Government Board that the auditor did not do his duty?
No, we have not. The administration was in a very poor condition, no doubt. Of course, the prohibitory order would exclude these cases. We also recommended that no out-of-door relief should be granted to able-bodied widows with one child only; to wives or families of militia men during duty; to persons having relatives capable of maintaining them; or to persons living in cottages or premises reported by the sanitary officer as unfavourable to health. Those were the cases where we recommended that no out-door relief was granted.

1522. Earl Spencer.] Then, those new rules were applied immediately?
First of all, we were told by the opposition, "You must not call them 'rules,' they must be 'recommendations'; we do not mean to be bound by them;" and, strictly speaking, they were right; and we altered the term, and hung up these recommendations in the waiting-room of the union and in the board-room.

1523. Was there considerable opposition to the new administration?
Very great indeed, for several years.

1524. Did you find that there was any difference in the action taken by ex officio guardians and elected guardians in that respect?
I think your Lordship was an ex officio guardian; but you gave us assistance, I am bound to say, in a very marked way on one or two occasions. Your Lordship was in Ireland at the time and could not attend, I am aware; but from the ex officio guardians who attended we got no assistance, but I should say the reverse.

1525. This action was principally taken by yourself and one or two others, I presume?
Yes.

1526. And you gradually instilled your principles into the minds of the majority of the guardians?
I do not think we have instilled our principles into the minds of the majority of the guardians; we have into some undoubtedly, but we have been sufficiently persevering to get the practice of many of the guardians to fall into harmony with our views. Still the difference between St. George's-in-the-East and Brixworth is this, that the principle is admitted in St. George's-in-the-East, and I should have no fear that if some of the guardians were away the law would be differently administered in St. George's-in-the-East; but in Brixworth I should have very great fear of that.

1527. But, practically, you have no cases of out-door relief given in Brixworth?
I think only one slipped in last year; but the report states the case.

1528. Is this the case: "There was no addition to the out-door list during the last half-year, and this is the fourth consecutive half-year to which this statement applies"?
Yes.

1529. Did you take yourself much personal interest in the particular cases?
Yes, I did. I visited with the gentleman who is our present chairman, with the Reverend William Bury, who was then my rector, the Rector of Hazelbeach; I visited, I think I may say every single case of out-door relief in the Union, a great many of them in the evenings when it was dark. I think that took us very nearly six months.

1530. Those
1530. Those were the cases that had been relieved under the former system? Yes.

1531. And did you find that there were a great many that were improperly relieved? Yes.

1532. Will you tell us what has been done with regard to medical relief out of doors? Medical relief has been entirely discontinued. I do not think we have a case at all of medical relief only. Of course if an out-of-door pauper were sick and ill, one of the regular out-of-door list, he would be attended by the doctor; but the cases of relief in medicine only, were very numerous in our Union, and we have now got rid of those altogether; there is not one. We have also got rid of the giving of any wine, spirits or beer. There may be a case where it is given where a man's heart is weak, or a person is dying, anything of that sort, but there is no wine, or beer, or spirits ordered for relief; and there used to be a large quantity.

1533. But supposing the medical officer recommended for a patient wine or beer, how would you deal with it? The medical officers do not recommend it, and those that I have spoken to on the subject tell me they are extremely pleased that we discourage its use.

1534. Chairman. But suppose you have the misfortune, as I should consider it, to have medical officers such as there are in some Unions, who persist in frequently recommending brandy or beer or wine as medical necessaries, have you any means by which you can check that? Nothing but constant contest at the board; I should persevere with my fellow guardians.

1535. Have you any power to refuse it? Certainly. The medical officer can give no order, he can only recommend.

1536. Would you consider that you would be justified in superseding the recommendation of a medical officer which he stated to be based upon his medical knowledge that such things were necessary? Not in an individual case, but I understood your Lordship to put the question to me if the medical man generally gave the order.

1537. I asked you in what way you would check it, and I understand that you would do so by contesting each individual case? Yes.

1538. But I concluded that if the medical officer persisted in saying that as far as his experience as a medical officer was concerned he regarded it as indispensable that these things were given, you would have to give them? I should say to the Board, "Under these circumstances, bring the person into the house" (that is what I should try to do); "do not let us get into the habit of giving this wine and beer and drink again." But if there was a man whose action of the heart failed, and they ordered him a tablespoonful of brandy, we should not contest it. If we found medical officers saying now, as they did before, that a weekly gill of wine was necessary for those persons' health, and ordering it medicinally; if any medical officer began to do such a thing, I should fight the thing to the best of my power, and I do not think the man would have a chance; I think he would find he could not go on with it. But that is one of the great recommendations of good administration, that you get rid of these cases. We have gone through the difficulty of guardians trying to cut down the medical officer's salary as they did the other day.

1539. Earl Spencer. Although the board do not give wine, I suppose there are other means very often of the poor getting wine? I think they provide it very much themselves; but almost in every parish, if not in every parish, an arrangement has been made, which we organised ourselves.
selves, with the medical men of the district to take individuals or families on at a fixed sum for medical treatment only, provided the money is prepaid. That has been one way in which the absence of poor law medical relief has been met.

1540. And medical clubs for children and women?
Yes; and the men, if they like to go on.

1541. In addition to the friendly societies?
Yes; it has nothing to do with the friendly societies; a man may be in a friendly society, receiving medical attendance from his friendly society, and his children may be receiving it from the medical club.

1542. Could you have carried out these reforms in the out-door medical relief, without having had these medical societies?
They would not have been carried out so easily; these societies helped us to carry them out; and upon that point, might I say that we broke up the bad clubs; there have been several benefit clubs that could not continue to live; their terms were too low, and their rules were bad, and they have been abandoned; and the better class of clubs have raised their payment. So that the whole tone of the people on the question of medical attendance and benefit clubs, I think, is very much raised and improved.

1543. Might I say that all this change created great dissatisfaction in the district?
It did at first, and with some people there still continues a very bitter feeling against those who have carried out the reform and are carrying it on.

1544. Do you think there have been many hard cases; breaking up homes, and so on?
No, I do not "think" about it; I may say I am sure there have not. I have jotted down just some of them myself that I am acquainted with. Perhaps I may say this much, that I have had those cases, for the purpose of this Committee, just revised and gone through to see what they were. Some of them were cases that were said to have been hard cases, cases of people about whom the medical officer asserted some years ago that they must die if they went to work, and they are living now and working very well indeed.

1545. Generally speaking, you have known a good many cases of people that did receive out-door relief, now earning an independent livelihood?
An independent livelihood; cases of bedridden people with diseases that we were told must be fatal, who after the relief was taken off have risen from their beds, have married and had two or three children, one of whom is living just behind St. Thomas' Hospital now.

1546. You have no doubt whatever that the change in the mode of administration has been beneficial to the people in the union?
I think that it has been very beneficial indeed.

1547. This change was done when people were in good circumstances?
Very much better circumstances as far as wages went; when wages were very much higher than they are now.

1548. Would it be difficult to apply a great change like this in a time of severe agricultural depression?
As a rule the poor are much more provident when times are bad than they are when times are good, and the law is generally, I think, administered better in the country when times are bad than when times are good; because when times are good the guardians in the country, being for a very large part farmers, feeling that they are doing pretty well themselves feel, "We will let these people have a share of our good things; it will not hurt us," and they vote for outdoor relief. But when they are pinched a little, economical views present themselves to their minds, and they are not quite so free even with the parish money.

1549. Earl
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1549. Earl of Milltown.] I understand you to say that relief is refused to persons who have relatives who are liable to support them. Will you kindly say what relatives are bound to support them?

The father is bound to maintain the child; the child is bound to maintain the parent; the grand parents are liable for the maintenance of grand children, but grand children are not liable for the maintenance of their grand parents. That last is wholly an exception; one that I tried to get altered; but that is the case. A man is liable if he marries a woman with illegitimate children, or with children by a former husband, for the maintenance of those children.

1550. In the case where a woman died, and where a verdict of manslaughter was found against the relieving officer, did she die as a matter of fact from the want of medical relief?

I really cannot say; I do not think any doctor was attending her; she had removed herself from the care of our doctor; she had taken herself out of the infirmary.

1551. Her husband was able to support her?

If he did not choose to drink all his money away; or if he was drinking it away, and anybody would trust him, he could have supported her; he was an able-bodied man, close to her and cognisant of her condition.

1552. Were any proceedings taken against him for leaving his wife without support?

No.

1553. Surely he was liable?

Yes.

1554. But nothing was done?

He would probably have bolted if anything had to be done.

1555. As a matter of fact, the woman did die from preventable causes?

If I recollect enough of the case, the woman would not have lived a month; she had got a fatal disease about her.

1556. But her life at any rate appears to have been considerably shortened for want of medical assistance?

Her life was shortened by coming away from medical assistance; by coming away from the good attendance she had had in the infirmary into a wretched room, where she could not possibly have been so well treated as she would have been if she had remained in the infirmary.

1557. She died the day after the relieving officer saw her?

I think she died within a day, or two days, after he told her he could not give her outdoor medical relief.

1558. Did he ask her to go back again?

Yes, he was bound to take her back again if she wished to go; but she knew the law perfectly well, because she had been brought under its operation.

1559. Earl of Aberdeen.] You spoke of the province of the poor law in matters of relief; could you give any definition based upon your large experience as to what would be the limits of the province of the poor law?

The relief of destitution without any reference to character.

1560. Then as to cases suitable for charity as compared with those suitable for relief from the rates, would you say that such cases were generally those where there was a risk of destitution without actual destitution?

In some cases there might be, and in some there might not.

1561. Has there been any complaint in St. George's-in-the-East as to charity being used to relieve the rates?

No, I have never heard of any complaints. I am glad to say we have hardly any endowed charities in St. George's-in-the-East; we are very well off in that way; we have only one charitable endowment, and that is an educational one.

(70.)

1562. In
1562. In the case of the man who was refused admittance to the casual ward because he had tools, he would have been refused admission to the workhouse if he had applied, I suppose? He would have had to go to the relieving officer, and if his name had been entered his case would have been considered; but our relieving officer would not enter him on the application book; he would say, you have visible means of subsistence.

1563. After he had sold his tools, if he were still out of work, you would have to admit him? If he were destitute, yes. I do not say that we should be obliged to admit him, but that he would be admitted; because that raises the question of whether the poor have any "right" to relief, but that is perhaps getting into rather a large question. We have refused relief to persons in St. George's-in-the-East who have stated they have been destitute who have come before the board. I recollect one case perfectly coming before the board when I was there myself. I asked the man, "Where did you pass to-day?" We knew very well he had been in a public-house all day at the corner of -- Lane, and had probably been sleeping in a lodging-house the night before, and we said, "You may go back to these people; they have been taking your money." The man said he would go to the docks and throw himself in and die. But he did not do that. I daresay it was a risky thing on our part to do, but we did not admit his right to relief.

1564. Earl of Milltown.] What did he do? I do not know; he did not go into the dock.

1565. Earl of Aberdeen] I was referring to the generally accepted fact that the respectable working men will not apply to the workhouse unless they are destitute. Assuming that this man presented himself with a bag of tools, that would be a sufficient proof, would it not? No, it would not be a sufficient proof; at least it would not satisfy a good board of guardians; they would want to know whether he had not any resources hid away.

1566. But I was referring to the case of a man who could show proof of respectable character; not a mere loafer or wanderer? We should not take a man's statement of his character as worth very much. I myself dismiss the idea of character altogether from these operations. You have no right to relieve a woman of the very worst character in any different way or in any less liberal way than you do a woman of the best character; and it is the same with a man. The qualification for relief is not character in any way; it should not be affected by it. The qualification for relief and the claim for relief can only be based, and is only based, in the English law, upon destitution pure and simple.

1567. But you say from general experience, that admission to the workhouse is a sufficient test of destitution? Yes, I think so.

1568. Earl of Strafford.] Do you approve of the practice of boarding out poor children in preference to their being brought up in workhouses? I do not myself, from the inquiries I have made in a few cases of children from London who are boarded out in the country; my experience is very limited, but I have once or twice, in travelling about the country, asked whether any children have been boarded out there, and I have gone to the children, and what I have seen in the house was not very encouraging; the food they had got before them, for instance.

1569. You do not think they were as kindly looked after, as far as diet and health are concerned, as they would be in the workhouse schools? No, I do not think they were. I think it is another form of out-of-door relief. We have cases of children being almost taken from the natural guardians. It seems to me a strange thing to take a child away from a parent and put it with a sort of foster parent.
1570. Has that practice been largely resorted to in the two unions of St. George's-in-the-East and Brixworth?

There is no boarding-out at Brixworth, and I do not think we have had any in St. George's in-the-East.

1571. Have you ever visited the large workhouse schools in the metropolitan area, Hanwell and Southall?

I have visited our own schools at Plashet for our own people.

1572. Is that in Essex?

In Essex, at West Ham. I might say with regard to our practice in St. George's-in-the-East that we are very careful not to offend the religious feelings of the people; and although we have very good schools at Plashet we do not put our Roman Catholic children there; we have made arrangements with the Roman Catholic schools. So that though we are strict in the administration of the poor law in St. George's-in-the-East, it is not a thoughtless administration; provided the people submit to the workhouse test, we do all that we possibly can without giving offence to their religious feelings or those of their relations.

1573. Then, on the whole, I may gather from your replies that you do not very much like the practice of boarding out children?

I do not; but I must say it is a question I have not studied much.

1574. Earl of Jersey.] If, as in the case you describe, a widow has two children at home and her other children away in a school, is she allowed to see these children periodically?

Yes, unless the woman is living in a place where there is scarlet fever or anything of that sort.

1575. In the case of the head of the family being taken into the infirmary for illness, is anything done for the relief of the rest of the family outside?

No. The practice of taking the man into the house and leaving the woman and children out of the house is a practice that is followed under a Prohibitory Order at Whitechapel; I think it is called the Whitechapel order; under which a man, the head of the family, is admitted into the house on certain restrictions. I think he can only take himself out once a week, and that with the consent of the guardians, and not be out more than 24 hours; and then the wife and children do not receive poor law relief under those circumstances.

1576. In the case of illness, and the man being taken to the infirmary, what would be done?

If the man was taken into the infirmary in illness, the woman and family, I think, would not have out-of-door relief, but I am not clear about that. I do not think they can, because I think our numbers would increase then so much.

1577. Lord Sandhurst.] With regard to emigration, I think you said that you organised a system of emigration for a large number of people?

I did not organise it; it was organised by two or three families who found the money, but I was called in as an expert when the money had to be applied. These benevolent people had made up their minds that they would emigrate a very large number of people from the workers who were engaged in ship-building, and they wanted somebody who was an expert, so that they might know that they were not imposed upon. I was not a guardian of St. George's-in-the-East then, but I had property in St. George's-in-the-East, and they thought it well to take somebody acquainted with the people in that district to see these persons personally.

1578. You say you have never heard from any of these people any more: Not one.

1579. Therefore you cannot say whether any of them were successful? I cannot.

1580. I suppose there was no selection of any trade or place for them?

(70.)
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Mr. Pell.  [Continued.

Yes, there was an agent who received them I think at Montreal. They went out under a special contract with Allan's Ship Company.

1581. You do not know whether they went on to the land?
No, I cannot say. The history of these people is rather singular. Most of them, I think I may say, had been agricultural labourers in Kent, and they had left their agricultural employment for work at Ashford, where there were works of the South Eastern Railway. They became rivetters, and when they heard of The Thames Company and of Dudgeon's Company offering better wages, they came to the Thames. They first abandoned the land, then the railway work, and then they came to shipbuilding in the Thames, where they were done for, and then they emigrated to Canada.

1582. Lord Hoptown.] You told us that you prefer private charity to charity distributed by organised societies?
Certainly I do. I do not object to inquiry by organisation if a man has not time to make the inquiry himself, but I think that charity that goes far afield to find objects for the exercise of it is very doubtful charity. I think I have quite people enough among my own relations and neighbours to take up all the spare time and money I have for them.

1583. You told us that the London Hospital took the paupers at a lower price?
Lower than I think they ought to have been paid for the services rendered.

1584. Why did they do that?
I suppose from the feeling that it was a charity.

1585. Not because they were interesting cases from a medical point of view?
No, certainly not on that account; and at the time there were, I believe, advertisements appearing daily in the "Times" or "Standard," "This hospital's income is 23,000 l. a year below its expenditure."

1586. Lord Thring.] Is there any objection to admitting medical students to the infirmary hospitals belonging to the unions?
That is a very difficult question; it is one I have considered myself and talked over with others whose opinion is valuable. I think it would be objectionable for one reason: You admit persons into the wards of the infirmary who are better kept out of them.

1587. Even under any supervision, your opinion is that it could not be so controlled as to be objectionable?
I think not; I think the Poor Law authorities of the Local Government Board would be able to state reasons against it.

1588. Lord Balfour.] Would you give me the result of your own experience as to the effects upon the character of poor people with whom you have come into contact of a lax as contrasted with a strict administration of Poor Law relief?
The effects that one has generally observed oneself are that they do not subscribe to clubs, or that they subscribe to bad clubs; they are slow to join provident societies; those sort of people hardly ever join provident societies.

1589. In districts where the administration of outdoor relief is what I call a lax one, is it a great discouragement to all kinds of thrift among the people?
Undoubtedly, a very great discouragement.

1590. One of the greatest?
I should say as great as it could be, and a great discouragement also (as I said at the commencement of my evidence), to charity, true charity, on the part of the better classes and the well-to-do classes.

1591. There
1591. There was one point of your evidence I want to question you upon. You advocate, if possible, the abolition of casuals as a distinct class?
Yes.

1592. Would not that also entail at the same time a much more stringent method of dealing with that class whom we call the "in-and-outers?"
I think it would. I think there ought to be legislation upon that point. I do not think it is advisable to let a man come into the casual ward of the workhouse, and then take himself out again just when he likes.

1593. Would you make the law much more severe upon those who are proved by experience to pursue that conduct, habitually going in and out?
Not while the law permits them to do that.

1594. But I mean, would you make the law more stringent upon that point?
Yes; I should like the law to run in this way: that a man must give some notice before he goes out.

1595. But he must give notice now, must be not?
He must give notice, if he wants to go out with the permission of the guardians; but there is nothing to prevent a man walking out when he likes, but if he wants to go out for a day or two days, then he must give notice and obtain consent.

1596. Chairman.] A pauper may leave at any reasonable hour?
Yes, excepting this, that if he has got children they may say, "You shall not go out unless you take your children with you."

1597. Lord Balfour.] Would it be a hardship upon a man who habitually goes in and out to force him to give some long notice before he can discharge himself; say 24 or 48 hours?
That is to say, if there was a change in the law, permitting you to treat him in that way?

1598. Yes?
No; I do not think it would be a hardship; you would know very well that a man who had been habitually popping in and out of the workhouse could be receiving no benefit from it, and therefore it would be no hardship to say to him, "You must discontinue your habit."

1599. What is your practice in St. George's-in-the-East in the paying of school fees?
We have the School Board there.

1600. You are the fee-paying authority, are you not?
No; the School Board deal with those cases; we have no payment of fees.

1601. Do you have many children sent to you by the School Board to have fees paid; is it not the practice and the law that the boards of guardians are responsible for the payment of fees for children of people who are not paupers, but who are in necessitous circumstances; they have that power under the Act?
They may, under the Act of 1876, pay them, if they choose to do it.

1602. Do your board ever pay those fees?
Hardly at all at Brixworth now. I believe that there are one or two cases; but there, again, the practice of the Brixworth board is just as different from the practice of other boards as it is on the out-door relief point. There is a statement here in one of these returns of the amount paid; it is very trifling.

1603. Chairman.] Do you think that the orders of the Poor Law Board, under which the relief is administered, require any alteration with a view to diminish the discretion of guardians as to giving out-door relief?
Yes, I think they do; and in the Seventh Annual Report of the Local Government Board you will find a statement of the points upon which I, and those who were acting with me, thought there should be a change in the orders; and (70.)
we pressed our views in a deputation to the President of the Local Government Board, I think it was Mr. Selater-Booth then, and stated what were the changes we desired.

1604. By "we" do you mean the guardians of St. George's-in-the-East?

No; there is a Central Poor Law Conference in London, of which I was chairman, and they considered the question, and the deputation came out of that body. We asked: "That in order to give better effect to the principle of the Poor Law, boards of guardians be empowered to frame bye-laws which, when duly approved by the Local Government Board, should have the force of orders until revoked by authority." They refused that, and there is the President's reply at length, which I need not read. We asked next: "That the liability for the maintenance of a pauper be extended to the grandsons of the pauper." The President said he was inclined to receive that proposal with favour; but no effect has been given to it in Parliament by legislation. We asked: "That all relief be recoverable at the discretion of the guardians within a certain limit of time after the stopping of the relief." That, again, they did not see their way to give us. We asked: "That a money value should be put on all medical relief, in order that it may be recoverable." There is the difficulty about granting medical relief upon the order. The President told us that if we would pay our doctors by cases we could put a value upon our relief, and we did not require that change in the law; so we lost that. We asked: "That power should be given to the justices in petty sessions, on the certificate of the medical officer of the district, to order the removal of an applicant, who is without lodging or accommodation, to the workhouse of the union." We should have got hold of some of the worst cases of prostitutes living and dying in St. George's-in-the-East. That was not given. We asked: "That no out-relief should be given for a longer period than 13 weeks without fresh application." He said we could do that for ourselves; and he was perfectly right. We asked, further: "That boards of guardians be empowered, if they have not the power already under Section 13 of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1876, to subscribe to the publication of the reports of the conferences held in the various poor law districts." That is done by a clause of my own in an Act of Parliament.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Reverend CHARLES HENRY TURNER, is called in; and Examined as follows:

1605. Lord Balfour.] You are Rector of St. George's-in-the-East?

Yes.

1606. How long have you been so?

Nearly six years.

1607. The population of your parish, we know, is one which may be said in general terms to be on the verge of pauperism, so far as many of the people are concerned?

I should say, so far as a very large proportion of the population are concerned.

1608. At the same time there is little or no out-door relief, in the general acceptance of the term, administered by the guardians?

No; I may say that there is no out-door relief; merely a few remnant cases.

1609. Does that policy meet with your concurrence; do you believe it to be in the interest of the people themselves?

Yes, entirely.

1610. What do you think are the reasons against what may be called a lax administration of out-door relief?

It is a very large question, but there seem to be several reasons that occur to one at once. The out-door relief has a great tendency to make the poor more improvident than they are already; it indisposes them to take advantage of savings
savings banks and provident clubs. I think there is an example very much to
the purpose given in Professor Fawcett's book on the Poor Law, in which he
gives the case of some miners about to start a provident society, but when they
found that members receiving relief from the club would not be eligible for
poor law relief they determined not to have such a society. Then, again, I think
it is very detrimental to the moral character of the recipients; it not only takes
away their independence, but also has a very bad effect upon their relations; it
prevents them from accepting their natural responsibilities. The children, for
instance, learn to think that they have no responsibilities towards their parents,
and that they need not take care of them in their old age. And then, again,
another important evil is that it certainly acts, that is in my opinion, as a stimu-
lus to population; persons are disposed to marry even with more improvidence
than they do now, when they think that at any rate they will have out-door
relief for their children if they are in distress.

1611. Can you say that the policy of the guardians in St. George's-in-the-
East is productive of any hardship?

No, I think not. My own opinion is that the organised administration of
charitable relief really brings to bear all the relief that is possible in St. George's,
in the circumstances of extreme poverty; that is to say, possible without doing
real injury. We have, as your Lordship is probably aware, in St. George's a
very well-organised system by which we believe that we give whatever relief
is possible to any deserving cases. The Committee of the Charity Organisation
Society is in close contact with the guardians, and in any cases where we think
real relief can be given, that would ordinarily be touched by out-door relief,
supposing that out-door relief was given, we really attend to.

1612. One particular case was mentioned to us to-day, I wonder whether you
are familiar with it, of a woman having been refused out-door relief by a relieving
officer and having died; a case in which a trial afterwards ensued?

I cannot recall the actual circumstances of the case, the circumstances which
led to the death of the person, but I remember perfectly well that when the case
came into the court the judge said it was one that ought not to have been
brought before him, and he asked whether it had been before the magistrates,
and found that it had only been committed by the coroner's court; and he
expressed his opinion that the officer was not at all to blame in the matter; and
I believe the officials of the Local Government Board expressed themselves very
strongly in the same sense, so much so that I understood they gave the officer
a gratuity.

1613. Paid his expenses, you mean?

I believe they had not power to actually pay expenses, but they gave him a
gratuity, which amounted to the same thing, being, in fact, exactly equivalent
to the expenses.

1614. You say that a large proportion of the population of your parish are
upon the verge of pauperism; is that a state of things which you think is irre-
remediable, or have you any suggestion to make for the improvement of the condition
of the people?

I am afraid, so far as the present circumstances of the parish are concerned,
I mean the labour, and so on, that it is irremediable; it is owing in great part
to the failure of the sugar industry, and again to the failure of the London Docks,
which you probably are aware are very nearly empty; so that we have a large
population, which, in former days, was kept well in labour by the docks and the
sugar industry, which now is only very casually at work, and there does not
seem to be any present cure for such a state of things. All one can do is to
give assistance where one sees that it can be productive of permanent benefit,
and do what one can by getting to know the people, bringing sympathy to their
distress and introducing whatever brightness one can into their lives.

1615. Is the population increasing or diminishing in numbers?

I think it is very much at a standstill. I cannot say what the actual figures
were at the last census as compared with the census before.

(70.)
1616. Do you see an improvement or a deterioration in the condition of the people during the years that you have been there; I mean, is their general condition better or worse?

I do not think that there is any greater lack of employment now than there was six years ago; but there is no doubt that every year's continuance of the present condition of things brings an increment to the distress.

1617. Is it the case in your district, as in some others that have been mentioned to us, that people marry at a very early age, and under improvident circumstances, when they have no real prospect of being able to bring up and educate a family?

Undoubtedly. My own impression is that a very considerable proportion of the cases where there are large families would be found upon investigation to be cases where the parents had married extremely young, and in many cases during their minority. I think it is a serious question whether something might not be done in that matter to bring what I suppose is virtually the law to bear upon the subject.

1618. What exactly do you mean?

I mean that the theory of the law is that a minor cannot marry without the consent of the parents; but in practice it is not at all carried out, because there is no penalty attaching to it now as there used to be. By the old canon law clergymen marrying minors without evidence of the consent of the parents were subject to a very severe penalty, but now after publication of banns they are quite irresponsible in the matter.

1619. You do not contemplate a revival of that, do you?

Not exactly that; but I think in many cases it is quite possible to prevent minors marrying without the real consent of their parents.

1620. How could you set about it?

I should not have thought that would have been any very serious difficulty; the penalty before might have been too great, but it is a reasonable thing, I think, to say that no minister or registrar should marry minors without having the consent of the parents.

1621. Would not the result be that there would be no marriage, but that the people would live together all the same?

In some cases it might be so, but in many cases not. I think many marriages are entered into in a very thoughtless manner, when a little discussion with the parents might prevent it. One comes across cases of girls being induced to marry, and hiding the fact of their approaching marriage from their parents.

*1622. Chairman.] Surely the registrar cannot marry now without the consent of the parent?

Yes, he can after the banns; after a list of the names has been published for the legal time. I believe he is under no responsibility in the matter.

*1623. That is to say, if the parents do not signify their dissent, the consent is assumed?

Yes; but the parents, unless they have got some reason to believe that such a thing is occurring, have no means of knowing that the banns are put up, because they are usually put up inside a small office.

1624. Lord Balfour.] I will ask you a question about the general administration of the law; has it now the support of public opinion throughout your parish; I mean the policy pursued by the board of guardians?

Yes, I think so; I should judge so.

1625. Have you anything to say to the Committee as to the effect of the distribution of the last fund raised at the Mansion House; I mean as to the effect of it on your people?

The effect was to cause a very great deal of excitement; it was impossible to exercise proper discrimination; in point of fact, I think more than 30 per cent. of the Christian population applied for relief (all Jewish applicants were referred at

[...The Witness desires to correct his answers to these questions; he was mistaken in stating that the Registrar can marry a minor without the consent of the parent; the fact being that the Registrar cannot marry until sufficient evidence of the consent of the parent or guardian has been produced.]
at once to the Jewish board of guardians), and it was quite impossible to distinguish much between them. I mean you could go into questions of character, but there was nothing further. A lot of money was distributed among them, which in some cases, no doubt, gave persons satisfactory present help; but, as to having any permanent effect on the population for good, it had not the slightest, and it only caused them next year to be very expectant and anxious for a similar fund to be started; for there was no exceptional distress in St. George's in that year at all.

1626. You are quite sure about that?
I am quite clear on that point.

1627. Have you any suggestion to make to the Committee as to any direction in which either by an amendment of the law, or in any other way, the condition of things in your parish could be made better?
Personally, I am very much of opinion that the only approach to a solution of the question is by emigration. I think a great deal might be done if it were possible to make emigration much more easy and attractive. I mean to say if emigration were carried out by the Government.

1628. Do you mean emigration by State-provided funds, or by the guardians, or by voluntary agencies?
Not by voluntary agencies, by State-provided funds; but I should have fancied it was possible to provide the money by a loan to the persons going to emigrate, making them at the other side work out by labour the amount of money advanced to them for their emigration.

1629. You mean that the people who would be emigrated would go with their own consent?
With their own consent.

1630. Are those who would be likely to go such persons as would be suitable to push their way in a rough life?
One very great obstacle to emigration is that any persons who have not possessed themselves of funds have to beg a great deal of money. They go to some emigration society, and are told that they will want 10l., of which the society will provide 4l., and they have to provide the other 6l. themselves; and they go up and down till they have collected the money. That even of itself is very unpleasant to persons who have any independence of character. But supposing it were known to be possible for anybody who really wished it to emigrate I think emigration would be much more taken up than it is.

1631. Is there any extended desire on the part of people you have been brought in contact with to try their fortunes in other countries?
No, I do not think there is at present. I think the thing would require to be taught a great deal.

1632. What would be the effect of its being announced that assistance would be given for the purpose of emigration? Would it not be rather to bring other people into the parish in the hope of participating? If it were done for the whole of London, would it not have simply the effect of drawing more men to London?
I did not mean at all to keep it to London, but to apply it to the whole country; if there were such a system of emigration by which persons anywhere in the country could be emigrated to other parts of the Empire. I was not at all meaning to confine it to London.

1633. Could you give us any idea of the conditions under which either the State or the municipality or boards of guardians should provide funds; perhaps you have not considered that?
I would only roughly make a suggestion. The suggestion I practically have to make is that it might be possible to advance the emigration money upon a sort of labour bond, so that if there were great centres of labour on the other side in the colonies to which persons emigrated, the emigrants could work at these centres for a certain time and so repay the loan.

Continued.
1634. Chairman] But have you considered whether these great centres of labour exist as a matter of fact; whether there are any such great centres of labour in the colonies?

There is a great quantity of waste land still not under cultivation.

1635. Did it never occur to you that it would be necessary to make preparation for placing these people on the land, and that that would involve a very difficult and costly operation?

No doubt it would. I did not mean at all to underrate the difficulty of it.

1636. Earl of Strafford.] Have you ever considered the question of the boarding out of pauper children—sending them to homes in preference to their being educated either in the workhouse schools within the unions, or in the different large workhouse schools in the Metropolitan area?

That has not occurred to me in connection with St. George’s, because we happen to have, for St. George’s, rather exceptional schools; the schools are small, and the children are very well looked after there; they do not have the appearance or character of workhouse children.

1637. What sort of numbers are there in the school?

I think about 300.

1638. Where is that?

At Plashet, in Essex.

1639. Then you have not considered practically the effect of it?

No, I have not had any practical experience of it.

1640. With regard to last winter, should you say that the destitution has been exceptionally great, or not quite so severe as in the winter of 1886–87?

I should say not quite so severe.

1641. Would that be mainly due to any revival of trade or industry in your district, or to the weather not having been so severe?

The winter has been an open one, and no doubt last summer there was more work than in the preceding summer.

1642. And on the whole perhaps the prospects are a little more encouraging than they were 12 months ago?

I think so, so far as regards employment.

1643. Earl of Jersey.] Am I correct in interpreting some evidence you gave, that it is owing to the Charity Organisation Society being in such close relationship to the board of guardians, that the board of guardians are able to do away with out-door relief?

Yes, I think the Charity Organisation Society are able to give relief where it is really necessary.

1644. But I meant rather putting it the other way, that the board of guardians are able to refuse out-door relief?

Yes, and if the relieving officer has a case which he thinks should be relieved he sends it to us, to the Charity Organisation Society.

1645. Then you are able to deal with it?

Then we deal with it.

1646. Lord Sandhurst.] Have you been instrumental in getting any people to emigrate yourself?

Very few.

1647. With regard to those you have been instrumental in getting emigrated, have you done it through a society?

I have not taken any case; I have merely helped them when they have been going.

1648. Have you heard from them after they have got out?

Only in one case, and they have done well.

1649. You
1649. You do not know as to the others whether situations were found for
them?

They mostly went to friends. There is one difficulty in St. Georges-in-the-East
that the ordinary labourer is not a suitable case for emigration; he does not know
anything about agricultural work; he is only accustomed to bear burdens. No
doubt before we could emigrate persons in any quantity from a parish like
St. George's, it would be necessary to train them at home, in home labour
Colonies, for instance.

1650. Earl of Aberdeen.] In the case of the relief given by the Charity
Organisation Society, supposing such was not available, would the cases be of
such a character that Poor Law relief would have to be given?

We should not refuse them at the Charity Organisation Society unless we
thought that they were distinctly Poor Law cases; that is, cases where nothing
could be done outside the House, or cases where the character was indifferent
upon inquiry.

1651. Have you had occasion to refuse many cases on such grounds?
Yes, we do continually.

1652. Then as a matter of fact charity is in this union stepping in to relieve
the rates to some extent?
In that point of view, yes, if your Lordship considers that it is the proper use
of the rates to relieve mere poverty and not destitution.

1653. I was assuming that we recognise the distinction between poverty and
pauperism, and that the rates are to relieve destitution?
We do not relieve destitution in the Charity Organisation Society; if a case
is destitute we consider it should go into the house.

1654. Therefore we may take it that cases which are relieved by charity are
not cases which strictly speaking, the guardians would be legally bound to
relieve?
No.

1655. You have had no complaints as to the apparent relief of the rates by
charity?
No, I do not hear it put in that way.

1656. Chairman.] Are your charities supported by the inhabitants of the
parish or by contributions from outside?
Very largely from outside, they are to a certain extent from the persons in the
parish and those connected with the parish owning property in the parish,
but more largely from outside.

1657. Then might there not be this objection raised to the system which
exists in your parish, that in point of fact the responsibilities which ought to
fall upon the owners of property in the parish are undertaken by people outside
from charitable motives?
That is an objection that certainly might be made.

1658. Do you think that your system has stimulated charity within the
parish?
Yes, I should say so.

1659. Lord Balfour.] Have you anything you would wish to add to your
evidence?
No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
Miss OCTAVIA HILL, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

1660. Lord Balfour.] You have had considerable experience of working in different ways amongst the class of people who have a great struggle to maintain themselves outside the Poor Law?
I have been at work since 1851.

1661. Almost continuously?
Yes, almost continuously.

1662. And chiefly within the metropolitan area?
Wholly within the metropolitan area.

1663. Of course, that being so, you have worked in districts in which the system of relief has varied considerably?
The Poor Law relief or the charitable relief do you mean?
Yes.

1664. Would you give the Committee your opinion of the effect upon the character of the poor themselves, using the word in its widest sense of these two systems, the policy of a lax administration and that of a stricter administration?
I should say that the stricter administration was by far the best for the poor, and by far the most really kind to the poor.

1665. And on what do you found that expression of opinion?
On what I see in the homes of the poor of the various systems of relief; and what I shall say about this is common to both Poor Law and charitable relief. They neither of them can really meet the wants of the poor, and they come in as an uncertain element to discourage thrift. Wherever you have either charity or Poor Law, bringing dots to the poor, you discourage the habit of belonging to clubs, the habit of saving, the habit of purchasing things, and possessing things; you bring side by side the man who has laid by nothing, and who is well cared for at a time when misfortune comes to him, and the man who has sacrificed something through his time of steady work, and on whom the whole burden falls when misfortune comes, he having to spend his savings, whereas the other man is helped from outside.

1667. When you are administering money derived from a compulsory rate, do you see any way of discriminating between the provident man and the improvident man?
Of course you can discriminate in the first place by offering the house to the one.

1668. But so long as you are dealing with public funds, derived from a public rate, is it possible to discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving?
No, I do not suppose it is with a compulsory rate.

1669. You would regard that as the province of charity?
Yes. The Poor Law has nothing to do with anything but destitution; character is nothing, or ought to be nothing, to the Poor Law. But then even as to the charitable funds, they seem to me a cruel kindness to the poor; one is glad of the sympathy they show, but as to their effects on the poor they are most disastrous.

1670. It destroys their independence and self-respect, you mean?
Yes; and raises hopes in them that cannot be fulfilled. Recipients build so much on the hope of something coming, which probably fails them at the very moment when it is most important to them.

1671. Do
1671. Do you know anything of the difficulties which have been experienced by those who have tried to establish provident dispensaries and medical relief associations in different parts of the metropolis?
I know from experience that it is almost impossible to establish a provident dispensary near our large free hospitals.

1672. Which ones do you allude to?
In Marylebone, several years ago, a small group of my own friends tried to establish a provident dispensary, and some of the poor were extremely eager to join it, but only a very small proportion, consequent on the fact that there was the Middlesex Hospital giving free relief to the out-patients, and the few people who might have cared to belong to the provident dispensary were not sufficient to keep it together; whereas in the suburbs, take, for instance, Hampstead and Battersea, I believe there are very successful provident dispensaries there.

1673. You know something of the one at Hampstead, do you not?
My sister is resident there, and I know something about it; the one in Hampstead was successful, but ours in Marylebone had to be given up.

1674. Would there be, speaking generally, any such difference in the circumstances of the two districts as to account for the comparative success of one and the failure of the other?
I should not have thought so. There is a report about the provident dispensaries in the metropolis, and I think you will find that all that are successful are suburban, because far from a hospital.

1675. Perhaps you could furnish us with a copy of that?
Yes, I could, I dare-say. I believe that the further one goes from the centres of wealth the more independent the people are, the more providence there is, and the more energy.

1676. All leading you to the belief, which you have already expressed, that the expectation of help without exertion tends to diminish the probability of the people exerting themselves?
Quite so.

1677. Have you any suggestion you would like to make to the Committee?
I do not know. One feels very strongly inclined to urge, on all possible opportunities, that people should keep quite clear from any danger of holding out to the poor hopes that something can be done for them which cannot be done; even inquiries set on foot by the Government raise very great hopes among the people. You will remember the inquiry made, I think it was last year; there were three districts in which inquiries were to be made as to the state of the poor. I happened to be in one of the districts selected on the day enumerators were sent round, and saw a great many of the people. “Government had taken it up now,” and I do not know what they were not expecting to get; they were all very full of hope about it, and of course the enumerators had been told lies all through the street; people told me what they had stated.

1678. Did you see the returns when they were published as a whole?
I saw a few of them in the districts I knew about.

1679. And when they were summarised it was the fact, was it not, that the statements were of such a kind that many people returned their rent as exceeding the whole of what they returned as their income?
Yes, I think that was so.

1680. That is what you referred to in saying that they were untrustworthy?
There were all sorts of collateral circumstances that changed the whole character of the case. In some cases the parents would say that they were out of work; and there was perhaps a grown-up able-bodied son earning £5 s. a week, bringing his money home, never mentioned in the Return at all. So (70.)
that very little was gained by the enquiry, and very false hopes were raised by it; and that is so whenever there is any talk of Government action. Again, the Mansion House Relief Fund, in the same way, raised extravagant hopes; and it is all speculated on. The people are exceedingly sharp, and the more their homes look miserable the more they expect to get; and the drink following the distribution of the Mansion House Relief Fund was something fearful.

1681. You are able to state that from personal knowledge?

Oh, yes; and again, that money that was given away by Mr. Montagu Williams not long ago in Deptford, was most injurious; there was one woman who was not sober for three weeks after getting it; another woman received relief whose husband was in full work, had never been out of work for 20 years, he was employed at the Victualling Yard or one of the large places there; and one man I knew received help who had never done any work for four years; he had lived on his wife's earnings.

1682. This again, I understand, you are stating from personal knowledge?

From personal knowledge. I was in the street at the time this man came back. He had got the money; he was quite drunk, and he was stamping about the yard and saying what he had told the people; I do not know what he had told them, but he had come back with the money quite drunk. In fact, it is our terror when any fund of the sort is given away in the neighbourhood; the only real way to help the poor is to get them to help themselves; to be side by side with them and try to encourage them to save and to work, and to have happy and nice employments and amusements, and keep their houses clean; of course there is scope for gifts; for large gifts such as open spaces and things that the people use in common, and that can be given once for all to them, but these miserable does bring the people up to London; there is no end to it. It is most curious to contrast a London with a country home. I am working in one street where I suppose if I wanted a thimble or a knife, or a teapot or a needle, there is hardly one to be had in the whole place; and yet the men earn when they are in work certainly from 20 s. to 25 s. a week, and everything except their rent is cheaper than in the country. When I go into the house of a man in the country earning 15 s. a week, his wife will have all sorts of things in the house. The poor of London live from hand to mouth; the women are bad housewives and do none of their own needle-work; I am not speaking of the artizans; I have worked very little among the higher classes of the poor; there is no doubt that there are a great many of them; but I am speaking of the casual labourer who is in and out of work according to weather.

1683. Absolutely improvident in every respect?

Absolutely improvident; and we take away almost every encouragement they have to providence.

1684. What, in saying that, do you particularly refer to?

The chance gifts that come pouring in from all sorts of kindly people, some of them far away, some of them near, all their gifts uncertain; instead of taking any one case, watching it, dealing with it thoroughly as it ought to be dealt with, people just come and give a small dole; the poor cannot count on it, it is neither income nor earnings, nor anything regular, and yet there is always a chance of it; the temper it encourages is like gambling (which they are very fond of); and when we have encouraged them, to trust us at the very moment when they are most in need, we are perhaps in the country out of the way, and we do not go near them at all.

1685. Earl of Aberdeen.] In the case of Deptford, where so much harm was done by the money given away, there was supposed to be an inquiry into each case, was there not?

I do not think Mr. Montagu Williams professed to have much inquiry.

1686. It was done through the police, was it not?

It was said to be to the police court that the people went up. The people said they had to get a receipt from their minister, by which they meant a reference; and some of them took this up, but in the case of a great many of them
I think there can have been no inquiry; certainly it must have failed very decidedly. I do not know whether they professed to inquire, but they failed very decidedly.

1687. They did not inquire at the people's own homes, apparently?
I do not think so.

1688. You spoke of centres of wealth causing more apparent poverty in the neighbourhood?
More apparent improvidence and want of independence.

1689. Were you referring to places where there were employers of labour, or places where there were charitable people?
I was thinking of the richer parts of London. Contrast Marylebone with Hoxton; I think you find much more independence in Hoxton than you do in Marylebone; a better tone among people, more expectation that they are going to bear their own burdens.

1690. Chairman.] In fact, in a district like Marylebone there are great facilities for begging or receiving doles?
Yes; look at the singers in the street.

1691. Earl of Aberdeen.] Is it your experience that the vast majority of people who are in the habit of begging are undeserving in the sense that they could get work if they tried, but they do not try?
I never give to them. I should not have the smallest belief that they were good cases. I do not think I should feel at all inclined even to enquire into the cases, so I could not say from my own experience whether they are.

1692. Do you think that more stringent measures, either through the police or otherwise, could be taken to check the system of begging, whether by singing or any other profession of poverty?
I should be very glad to see such taken; but, of course, the public have it very much also in their own hands; if they would not encourage begging, it would not continue as it is. One hears of people getting a great deal in that way; I do not know how far it is true, but one always hears that they receive a very great deal.

1693. In reference to the hospital relief, do you consider that the system of out-patient relief is mischievous?
Without inquiry, yes, certainly, on its present scale. I should be very glad to see the out-patient department of the large hospitals reformed. I think, in every way, it would be very much better; I do not think they have time to give proper attention to the cases they have, from the habit of giving relief to everybody.

1694. There is practically no inquiry?
None.

1695. A large crowd of people attend, and the doctors do the best they can in the time?
Yes; in some cases there are out-patients' letters, but they are given in great numbers.

1696. Do you think many people resort to that kind of relief from the hospitals who could afford to pay for it?
Undoubtedly, to pay for it in some form or another; not to pay at the moment they are ill, but to pay in the form of subscribing to provident dispensaries.

1697. Do you see any increase of a feeling among the people that even outdoor relief is a thing to be avoided if possible?
No, I do not think I do. I think people are very ready, increasingly ready, to accept either charity or any other relief that there is at hand.

1698. People who would think it derogatory to go to the workhouse?
I do not know whether they would think it derogatory, but they would not choose to go into the workhouse.
1699. They would object to the residence?
Yes, they would object to the residence, and they would think it disagreeable. I should say, speaking generally about the condition of the poor of London, that, since I can recollect, their condition has markedly improved. They have better rooms, more of them, more appliances in them; better schools, better clothes, better food, even less drink, decidedly less drink; but that their temper is more dissatisfied and more difficult to deal with. I hope it may only be a transition stage, but that is where they seem to me worse. They are more dissatisfied, and they expect a very great deal from other people, and they are rather less thrifty.

1700. Do you think that that is owing to the indiscreet methods of relief that have been rather common during recent years?
Yes. I think, you know, that many more educated people are coming forward to care about them and sympathise with them and so on, and are taking the tone that it is their duty to do it (which it certainly is), and the poor feel it and see it and say it, and they expect help to come in forms in which it does not seem to me that it will really be helpful to them.

1701. But has there not been a great deal of special distress owing to the depression of trade?
Of course, one hears a very great deal about it, and it is a question very difficult to generalise about.

1702. But is it not inevitable that in a time of depression of trade many persons will be out of employment who would otherwise obtain work?
At the same time, you know, at the very time you are hearing of all this, you see crowds of the poorest in the public-houses.

1703. Chairman.] Are you of opinion, notwithstanding the statements which have been made in some quarters, that there is any ground for saying that the condition of the labouring population in London is, as a whole, worse, or that there has been exceptional distress during the last five years.
Of course, people have statistics, and they seem to be sure about the depression. I do not know. I look at a small area very attentively, and I cannot say that I see much difference in the number of people out of work. Of course, there are always people out of work in London.

1704. Have you seen any statistics that can be relied upon, and which go to prove an increase of poverty in London?
No. I do not think I feel so sure about it at all. If I judged from my own experience, I should not have said that there had been any exceptional want among the people.

1705. To a certain extent there has been increased pauperism in London, as we know from the Returns?
Yes.

1706. But if there was anything like a widespread distress in London, would it not be shown in very much higher figures?
That is what it seems to me, that the returns of pauperism do not show very exceptional distress. There has been a tremendous amount of writing and talking about it, and, of course, it is rather arrogant for me, with such a small area under my view, to say anything about it; but just looking at it from my own point of view, I should not say that there was exceptional want. Of course there are always a certain number out of work.

1707. Earl of Aberdeen.] I suppose anything which causes an expectation of relief, such as a Mansion House Fund, must cause distress, because it will bring a number of people in.
Yes, it does bring people in from the country; that is one very sad thing about it.

1708. Would you say that the habit of receiving charitable does is almost as deleterious as receiving relief from the rates where it is available?
Yes;
Yes; if it comes from a large fund, such as the Mansion House Fund; it is very bad, as bad as relief from the rates. Where it comes from human beings to human beings there is always something in the feeling that does good; there is kindly feeling and sympathy.

1709. You refer to such an administration of charity as that by the Relief of Distress Society by almoners?
Yes; the almoners go into the homes of the poor and see them, and show a certain amount of human sympathy.

1710. You would not wish to see that kind of administration reduced?
I should like to see the whole body of charitable relief altogether altered in character. I do not believe that doles are doing the poor any good at all, whether they come from one person or another. I do not believe in gifts of bread and coals and clothes and boots as benefiting the poor. I do not say there never has been an age when they have done good, but I do not think they are what are wanted now at all. On the other hand, I think the poor want large and intelligent help. For instance, the training of children in industrial schools seems to me a very good form of help. There is a large scope for gifts, but not for gifts of the kind I was referring to just now.

1711. I recognise the justice of what you say about the mischief of doles in that sense, but I should like to ask what advice do you give where you meet with a case of bond fide distress, where a person through no fault of his own has lost employment and has no means of livelihood; what do you recommend in such cases.
I do not find them very abundant. I should take each case on its merits. I think my advice to anybody would be, do not deal with a case unless you mean to take it up thoroughly and carry it through; have a plan about it.

1712. Do you find in districts with which you are acquainted that there has been any considerable immigration from the country during the present year?
Not only during the present year, but always, there are people coming up. One is rather sorry to find it.

1713. You allude to people from the rural districts?
Yes, I am sorry to see them coming into London.

1714. Lord Balfour.] You have used the expression in one or two recent answers "my district;" I do not think we have got upon the notes what you call your district?
I have several, scattered over different parts of London.

1715. Perhaps you would specify them?
I have districts in Deptford, Southwark, and Marylebone. A great deal of my former work is very much out of my hands now, and those three are the parishes I have most personal connection with now.

1716. Earl of Strafford.] Have you taken much interest in the subject of the education and the training of pauper children?
I have never been guardian or manager of a school. I have watched the boarding-out system on a very small scale only.

1717. What is your opinion on it?
Very strong indeed in favour of it with regard to girls; I do not know about boys, but for girls I think if you want to break the hereditary pauperism, nothing else is effectual. The cases of boarding-out I have known have been most satisfactory; they are not very numerous but those I have known are very successful.

1718. And do you think there is adequate supervision of them after they have been boarded out?
In the cases I have known there has been. Of course, it is very important.
1719. On the whole, then, you speak very favourably of your opinion and experience?
Yes, very strongly indeed; I should be in favour of boarding out. In fact, all one sees among the poor makes one see that the institution should yield to the family.

1720. In short, it is substituting home-life for the workhouse?
Yes.

1721. Earl of Hopetoun.] I suppose, although there is not an enormous number of people actually out of work, yet the wages are very much less than they were?
No. I have often thought that it was rather curious; you see the skilled workman asking the same rate of wages. One would have thought that there was depression, that would not have been the case, if almost everything, however, has gone down in price except wages. I am speaking of the skilled workman now, and he asks at least as high wages as he has ever asked, and one sometimes wonders whether the wages will not have a little to decrease before trade is started again. Of course that is not a question for me; but wages have not gone down, no class of wages that I know of.

1722. I suppose the class of people you are connected with are not the actual high-skilled artisans?
No; but the other wages have not fallen. There may be more out of employment; that I cannot say; but men are asking as much hour by hour and day by day as ever they did. When bread was 11d., the wages of an in London unskilled labourer were lower than they are now, when it is 8d.

1723. Even when in comparative want, will they stand out for wages?
Yes, markedly, and with a very strong feeling indeed about.

1724. They will rather take no employment than fall back on a lower wage? I have seen men go away rather than take even slightly lower wages; that is a point of honour, I believe.

1725. They will rather go to charity?
Oh yes, certainly they would, many of them.

1726. We have heard a great deal this last winter about starting relief works for the people out of employment; do you approve of that?
Certainly not.

1727. I suppose it is merely relieving them for a time?
Yes, there are many objections to relief works. So marked is the cheapness of things now, that you can bring a smile on to anyone's face when they are talking about bad times if you say, "Everything is very cheap." "Yes," they say, "it is," and the wages of the younger members of the family who are in work will now purchase more than a man's wages would get when things were dearer. Of course I do not mean that the condition of things is very satisfactory. One would like to see the homes very different from what they are; but certainly since I have known London the progress in the homes of the poor is very marked.

1728. Earl of Jersey.] Do you find that the houses are better?
Yes.

1729. Is that going on?
Steadiy going on; and the people are more accustomed to comfortable appliances. I can remember the time when you could hardly persuade them to have an oven, and now they say, "What! no convenience!" and they turn up their nose and walk out.

1730. Are the rents higher?
They have slightly fallen of late. They rose at one time since I remember, and then they slightly fell.

1731. Chairman.] I know you have considerable experience as to the homes of the poor in London. Have you come to the conclusion that it is possible to provide
provide a decent habitation for the poorest of the people at a rent which would pay for the construction and maintenance of the house?

Yes, I think so. The amount of accommodation would hardly come up to one's standard in the country, you know, but it would be a marked improvement upon what they have.

1732. Do you think it is possible to build a decent house for the poorest people at any rent which would compensate the builder?

I should think so. The problem of making houses in London pay is increasingly difficult. Rates have gone up and rents have slightly gone down, and then there is such a very large quantity of property unlet now, which used not to be so; therefore, as to its paying, it is a little difficult to tell; one must know what the conditions of the parish are, and how much must be really set aside for unlet rooms.

1733. Has there been any considerable amount of misery caused by large clearances of the poor quarters of London, and consequent crowding of the inhabitants into other parts of London?

Not latterly, so far as I know.

1734. Lord Thring. Supposing a person had no time to personally take up charity as it ought to be done, and supposing him to have a great deal of money what should you recommend it to be given to?

Rather large things. Unless he knows anyone well who is working among the poor, and whose hands he can strengthen, I should say let him look out for large things like open spaces, and things which are a radical help to large bodies of the poor. I do not think he can deal with individual cases.

1735. Should you recommend him to subscribe to the Charity Organisation Society?

I should certainly say, subscribe to that, but not to the relief fund of it.

1736. Otherwise, if you could not administer charity personally, you would administer it through the people you knew?

There are very few people, I know, whom I would trust with money to give wisely to the poor. I would say give it to industrial schools; give it to such a place as the Boys' Home at Church Farm, East Barnet, and you would do unmitigated good; there is a number of those schools of the greatest use. You can put the children of widows there, and get a really well-educated member of the family, who is a centre of good to it for life. There are training ships for boys; preparation for work is an unmitigated good.

1737. I am afraid that some of them are mismeant sometimes, are they not?

Yes; but much may be said, too, in favour of pensions for the old, who have been provident, I could well find out good institutions.

1738. Would you give it to the London hospitals?

I should like the out-patients' departments of the London hospitals to reform themselves.

1739. Earl Spencer.] I think I understood you to say that in your opinion the condition of the poor in London has improved in a variety of ways; did I understand you to say at the same time that you did not think there was greater thrift?

I do not know that I ought to say so. One sees by the Post Office Savings Banks how very much is saved; but among the class I am dealing with, I cannot see any signs of it.

1740. How did the improvement come about in the condition of the poor?

Wages have risen; and I think we owe a great deal to the teetotal organisations. Bad as drunkenness is, it is certainly less than it was; and I think it is possible that the Board Schools are telling on the people; the children are surrounded with nice influences, and a greater number of them are in school; and that will tell. Things are very cheap. Look at the quantity of fruit that comes to London. Their diet varies so much more than it used to do. Look at the quantity of flowers.

1741. In
1741. In some sense there is an improvement then?
   In their spending the money in that way, if you call it thrift; I rather mean by thrift laying up something for the difficulties of another time.

1742. They appreciate a better standard of living?
   Yes, I suppose they do; one wishes their standard was still higher. But I think they do appreciate a higher standard of living.

1743. And you attach great importance to the efforts that have been made for giving them improved dwellings, and doing away with some of the old courts:
   Certainly; doing away with some of the old courts. I think the building is pretty well started now; I think the model dwellings set the fashion, and proved that good dwellings would pay, and the builders have now learnt how to meet the want, and that we may quite leave them to do so.

1744. And when the people get into these improved dwellings, there is a marked improvement in their own condition?
   That depends a great deal on the management of the dwellings, especially the blocks. A block of buildings requires a great deal of management. You bring together a vast number of people using a certain number of things in common, and, if those people are not civilised, they drag one another down very much indeed, and the blocks will be worse than the houses a great deal. So that a great deal depends on management.

1745. A great deal of your work lies among those people who are not in improved dwellings?
   Yes, I find it almost impossible to put the rougher people into the blocks. It is not a question of money, as most people think; the difficulty of getting the lowest class into the blocks is not a question of money, but a question of how they will live if they are brought into what I may call a rather more highly organised life, where they use things more in common.

1746. Then also many would not be able to get work enough to support them in that position?
   No, the rent is not the difficulty, but the habits of the tenants; for instance, the staircases are all used in common. If you have a drunkard who falls down in the middle of the staircase on Saturday night, the other people do not care to climb over him; if he is in his own cottage, distressing as it may be to his wife, she alone suffers. If you have a block where 120 families are accommodated, and some of the children use very dreadful language, they injure all the rest. If a man with delirium tremens rages on the balcony, the sound re-echoes through the whole building.

1747. What all those difficulties lead to is that the poorest do not go into those dwellings?
   The roughest do not. And thus you may have beautiful dwellings unoccupied side by side with fearful overcrowding, in the low court; and people go into the court and say, "What a dreadful want there is of dwellings!" and near by there are dwellings standing half empty.

1748. Are not the dwellings filled by a better class?
   In some instances; but not necessarily, because they can pay the money. Room by room, I think you will find that the improved dwellings are not dearer, sometimes they are cheaper than the dreadful rooms in the old courts. But the standard of living is higher in the dwellings, so that you cannot get the roughest accepted as the tenants. The character of the tenant is very often the question.

1749. Are a great many of these improved dwellings in blocks in consequence empty?
   A quantity. In Southwark there are quantities of tenements standing empty; in Deptford the same; it is rather from a different cause, perhaps, in Deptford. But in many districts there are a great number of rooms empty.

1750. Would
1750. Would not the better class of people who have not got these weaknesses be drawn to these places?

Where the better class want to live, they do fill them. There are certain dwellings always full—Sir Sydney Waterlow's almost without exception.

1751. Will they not gradually get filled, though they may be empty for a certain time?

Let us hope so. I do not know whether builders are not over-building now; that remains to be seen.

1752. What do you say as to what has been rather a new system in London; having improved workhouse hospitals?

You mean what we call infirmaries; I have no special experience of that at all.

1753. You do not know whether people who ought to get medical relief independently go there on account of the great comfort they get?

No, I do not know that as a fact; I should not at all wonder at it.

1754. I thought you might, as you drew attention to the effects of the hospitals?

The out-patients I was referring to.

1755. Earl of Milltown.] What do you chiefly object to in the management of the London hospitals?

Only that the out-patients' department, as at present organised, entirely cuts out all possibility of provident dispensaries being established, and looking at the large number of cases, it seems to me as if they would do better to deal more thoroughly with a smaller number of cases; with a selected number of cases.

1756. You think that they are too universal in their charity?

Quite so.

1757. But still, looking upon it as a matter of charity, and not as a matter of Poor Law administration, do not you think it is a great blessing to the poor to be able to get medical relief without payment?

If you do not look upon medical relief as a thing that people ought in a measure to provide for themselves; but it seems to me rather an anomaly to provide all your poor people with medical relief free. You do not do it in the country where the wages are much lower; why should you assume that all the working men in London are to have all their families provided for in this respect?

1758. But without assuming that all are unable to provide for themselves, do not you think one might fairly assume that a good many are?

Then I think you should see that you get the right people. If hospitals separated their in-patient and out-patient fund, I should feel more confidence about giving; but it seems to me rather a pity their providing free out-patients' letters upon such a scale.

1759. Have you any knowledge of the Peabody Buildings?

None, but from just having been over them once or twice, and knowing a few people who live in them.

1760. Have they worked successfully amongst the poor?

I should have thought so, and they are among the buildings that are almost always full.

1761. Is that because they are less strict in their inquiries as to character?

No; so far as I know, it is a great deal, because they are being helped by a huge donation; they are let a little under what be a remunerative price to capitalists.

1762. I thought the trustees avoided doing that?

They do not pay, I think, the same per centage that capitalists would be willing to take for their money. Of course that must influence the rents. The managers must feel that there is an element of charity in it, because they limit the amount of wages that a man may earn in order to gain admission.

(70.) C c 1763. That
1763. That is in order to bring it within reach of the poor?
That seems to me rather a pity; I should have liked them to be on a self-
supporting footing; I am sorry they have not put their buildings on a remune-
orative footing.

1764. I understood that they were on a remunerative footing?
They pay some interest, but I think the managers have to be very particular
about character of the tenants. They are very strict and very wise about their
management; as far as I have seen them, they succeed very well.

1765. The empty blocks that you spoke of, are they buildings let out of
flats, or small houses, separate houses?
Let in tenements, large blocks of buildings.

1766. Let in flats?
Yes.

1767. There are a good many of them which are empty, I understand?
Yes.

1768. Is that because of the strictness of the inquiries into the character of
the applicants, or because there are no applicants?
It is want of very successful management, I think, a good deal of it.

1769. It is not that the people are not desirous of getting into better homes,
is it?
I think very often it is. Sometimes they do not like the restrictions of the
place, or else it may be that the rampant people have been allowed in, and that
the tidy people have been kept out; very often it happens that a few very bad
people are in, and that they keep out the better quiet people.

1770. You spoke of these drunken people and so forth; you meant that they
deter respectable people from coming in?
Yes, either they get possession of a block and deter respectable people from
coming in, or they are themselves kept out because they will not live up to the
standard of decent families.

1771. That standard is not very strict in these places?
Not too strict at all.

1772. Did I understand you to say that the poor now buy flowers for their
own homes?
Oh yes; you see flowers sold in stalls in all poor neighbourhoods on Saturday
nights; they are very cheap; wall-flowers and such like.

1773. Lord Balfour.] You have condemned alms-giving in more than one
form, and the hospitals; may I ask whether you can give me any definition of
what you regard as the duty towards their poorer neighbours of those who are,
in the common phrase, rich?
I think they are bound to give very largely where they see it is really helpful
to the poor; but I think they ought to know that what they give is really
helpful to the poor, and in my estimation at this moment in London doles are
not really helpful to the poor.

1774. There should be much more personal dealing of one class with another;
is that what you mean?
Yes; and I think when there comes to be that personal dealing, the rich
will see that if people want any help at all they want a good deal more than
mere doles; that a shilling or half-a-crown or a sack of coals given when the
people are out of work is not really helpful at all; that they want a girl got to
service, or a boy trained, or some one helped to emigrate. Help would have to
be much more carefully planned, thought out, much more like the cases that
you see advertised in the Charity Organisation Society's Reporter, where a
distinct plan is taken up for a family, and you find radical good is done for
them and done thoroughly well, and you avoid uncertain doles, with their
temptation to gambling.

1775. Chairman.]
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1775. Chairman.] Do you think that the Poor Law administration ought to be supplemented by an organisation of charity in every district?

Not if the charity is going to be of that kind which gives doles.

1776. If the charity is one that would give largely to the poor in the shape of doles when they are out of work, might it not be the case that the result would be as disastrous as if outdoor relief were given.

It would be fearful.

1777. Now the kind of charity, I apprehend, that you would approve of, besides those objects that you have mentioned, would be where, by timely aid in the shape of a gift on some special occasion, a man or his family might be put in the way of earning an honest living.

Yes.

1778. Such assistance as that given by an individual who knows the family personally, and will be prepared to follow out the case and see to it, you would approve of?

Yes. And also, of course, there is a very great deal that people may do by being liberal and wise towards all the people they come in contact with. We are all more or less employers of labour; we have poor relations, and people who have more or less claim on us; I think we might take a large view of our duty to them.

1779. You would probably be of opinion that no organisation can ever take the place of individual effort?

Never.

1780. And that the best charity is that given by individual effort?

Quite so.

1781. Taking a general view of London poverty, do you think that the Poor Law as at present administered is sufficient for all the purposes to which a Poor Law ought to be properly directed?

That is a large question. I should have thought so, but I do not know that I have thought it out. I should be sorry to see it extended in the way of any greater laxity. I would rather see it curtailed than extended.

1782. You would not say that it fell short in the amount which is given to the poor; taking the whole system you would not say that any further demand upon the rates, with larger amounts being distributed amongst the poor, is desirable?

No, certainly not.

1783. On the contrary, you would probably think that a somewhat stricter administration than that which prevails in some parts of London would be beneficial?

Decidedly.

1784. You do not think it could be said with any truth that the Poor Law in London has failed to meet the wants of the poor; rather, that it may not always have been wisely administered?

Yes, I should say rather that it had not been wisely administered.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Luna, 7th May, 1888.

Lords Present:

Earl of Jersey.  Viscoun Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Earl Spencer.  Lord Bishop of Rochester.
Earl of Milltown.  Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Earl of Onslow.  Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Strafford.  Lord Thring.
Earl of Kimberley.

The Earl of Kimberley, K.G., in the Chair.

Mr. Augustus G. Crowder, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

1785. Chairman.] You are at present, and have for some time been, I believe, a Guardian of the Union of St. George's-in-the-East?
I have been so for 13 years.

1786. What is your opinion as to the adequacy of the guardians' powers with regard to able-bodied men?
I should like to divide that subject into two heads. In unions where the out-door regulation order is in force, I should consider that their powers are fully adequate, because under that order the guardians are able to give any amount of out-door relief to able-bodied men provided they set them to work, and there is no restriction as to the sort of work they may be set to. In regard to unions where the out-door regulation order is not in force, and where the guardians have adopted the provisions of the prohibitory order, there certainly is a grievance. An able-bodied man is unable to obtain relief from the guardians without breaking up his home, there being no labour yard.

1787. You used the expression, "adopt the provisions;" but I suppose you meant, where they act in accordance with the provisions, although the order is not actually in force?
"Virtually adopted," I ought to have said.

1788. Will you first give us your opinion as to the working of the law where the prohibitory order is not in force, and where the out-door relief regulation is in force?
I have no experience as to that. In St. George's-in-the-East our labour yard has been closed almost ever since I have been a guardian.

1789. I understood you just now to say that where the prohibitory order is in force you do not consider that the provisions of the Poor Law are adequate to meet the case of the able-bodied?
I think there is a grievance in those unions.

1790. Are you in favour of labour yards?
No. I will now state, if you will allow me to do so, the mode in which I should meet that grievance, either by co-operation with charity as in St. George's-in-the-East, or by the adoption of what may be called the modified workhouse test regulation order, lately issued to the Whitechapel Union. In St. George's-in-the-East provident able-bodied men are relieved entirely by charity.
charity at their own homes. In improvident cases the Charity Organization Society give relief to the family upon the disagreeable condition of the man's entering the workhouse for a week or so, the relief being continued for a limited period to him with his family on his discharge from the workhouse, in order that he may have an opportunity of finding employment.


1792. When you say in co-operation with charity, do you mean that relief would be given in such cases where charity was also given to the same recipient?
No, I mean that the man would be dealt with by the guardians, and that the wife and family would be dealt with by charity.

1793. Then I understand you to say that if the relief is continued to the man after this test week, the family would continue to receive aid from the Charitable Organization?
Yes, the whole family would receive charity after the week, man and all.

1794. But do you give relief from the rates to the man after his departure from the workhouse?
No.

1795. Would you state what the Whitechapel order is?
In the case of any able-bodied man relieved in the workhouse who shall not absent himself therefrom, more than once in any one week, nor for a longer period than 24 hours, nor without the consent of the guardians, it shall be lawful for the guardians to give out relief to the wife and family without setting the man to work under the out-door relief regulation order.

1796. Is there any limit of time as to the granting of the relief; may it be continued for a long period under the Whitechapel order?
The Whitechapel order above described was issued by the Local Government Board for a limited period. The guardians had it in their discretion to continue the relief in the form sanctioned, so long as the order was in force. The period has now elapsed. The object of the order is to make the powers of guardians more elastic during the winter.

1797. Supposing that a man comes into the workhouse under the conditions prescribed, and that subsequently relief is given to the wife and children, is the relief limited to the wife and children when the man goes out, or may it include the man himself?
The amount of the relief would not be increased by the guardians, but the man would participate in it for the 24 hours in the week when he went out to look for work.

1798. He would still remain in the workhouse?
Except for the 24 hours in each week.

1799. The object, therefore, is to enable the man to go out and obtain work if possible, and, during the time that that process is going on, to afford such support to the wife and family as will prevent the necessity of their coming into the workhouse and the breaking up of the home?
Yes.

1800. Ought that practice in your opinion to be continued for a long period?
I see no objection to its being continued until the labour market requires the labour of those men who are taking their relief in the workhouse.

1801. Of course, the guardians would naturally by inquiry test whether the man was bona fide seeking for work?
I doubt whether they would be able to do that.

1802. Might not a man remain in the workhouse during the whole of the winter on the pretext of going out every now and then to obtain work, and get his family supported out of doors the whole time?
Speaking
Speaking from my own experience, there would be no temptation to do that. The dislike of these men to go into a workhouse, even for a week, under the St. George's-in-the-East plan is very great. It is a complete test, in my opinion.

1803. Then I may conclude from your answer that you have not in St. George's-in-the-East able-bodied men, who have no particular objection to going to the workhouse in the winter?

Not decent able-bodied men who have decent homes. In St. George's-in-the-East we should only offer relief under this modified test if the home was worth keeping up; in the case of the very lowest class, who had no bedstead and next to no furniture, we should offer the workhouse to the whole family.

1804. Then it would come, would it not, to what I implied in my former question: that the guardians would exercise a discretion based upon their knowledge of the case, and would not avail themselves of this order unless the home was decent, and there was reason to believe that it was worth while to maintain it?

Yes; I would rather say that the discretion exercised would be based more upon a knowledge of the state of the home than anything else.

1805. Supposing that a man (as I am afraid may sometimes happen) was a worthless person, who was not very anxious to maintain himself by labour, and that the wife and family were decent people, in that case, do you think that such an order would work well; would it give encouragement to such a man to avoid maintaining his own family?

No, I do not think that he would go into the workhouse unless he had some feeling for his wife and family. A man who neglected his home and his wife and family would, I am afraid, refuse the offer.

1806. I think I clearly understand from you that, in common with the other guardians of St. George's-in-the-East, you are entirely opposed to the establishment of a labour-yard.

I am entirely so. As you may have observed, I have put down in my statement what seem to me to be the chief objections to labour yards.

1807. Are there any reasons which you would like to lay before the Committee, as to your objections to the labour yard?

I should rather like to be allowed to add the advantages of this plan which I have been describing, as against the labour yard, that is to say, the plan of what may be called a modified workhouse test. In the first place, it acts as an efficient test of distress, and as a lesson in providence to the man and his neighbours, yet without breaking up the home. Secondly, the relief is adequate to the wants of the whole family and is not, as in the case of labour yard relief, given into the hands of the man, who may or may not share it with his family. Thirdly, the burden of sacrifice is thrown on the man, he has to do the disagreeable thing, whereas, in many other schemes for dealing with this class, the sacrifice is liable to be thrown upon the wife and family. Fourthly (and this is perhaps the most important point of all), it withdraws from the market the superfluous labour which is gradually absorbed again as the demand arises, while the first chance of employment is given to the provident men, who being able to remain at home are enabled to answer the first call.

1808. You are of opinion that the pressure should be put upon the men by requiring them to do something which is disagreeable to themselves; but will it not remove from them a considerable amount of pressure if they are no longer obliged to consider the hardship which may be entailed upon their wives and families by their applying for relief?

I am of opinion that this modified workhouse test is a sufficient test.

1809. But that does not exactly answer my question. A man now has to consider both the unpleasantness to himself of going into the workhouse, and also the hardship to his wife and family of their having to come into the workhouse, and the inconvenience which may befall the whole family by the break-
ing up of the home. If you remove all the incentives to exertion which arise
from the man having to consider the position of his wife and family, and of his
home, are you not removing a very considerable inducement to the man to
exert himself to maintain himself and his family?
Yes, to some extent. In the course of my experience of 13 years as a
guardian, for about 10 years we have gone upon this plan, and I am able to say
that the cases are not numerous in which this offer is taken advantage of.

1810. Do you think that such a provision as the Whitechapel order is
specially applicable to town populations, and ought to be confined to them, or
should you think that it might be of universal application?
I do not think that it is necessary in the country; I do not think that the
prohibitory order acts with undue severity in the country. I fancy that
Mr. Pell mentioned to the Committee the other day, a point which has also
occurred to me, that in rural districts where cottage rents are paid generally
quarterly, a man may lock up his cottage and go into the workhouse with his
family during temporary want of employment without breaking up his home.
But in towns rents are paid weekly, and it is not possible for a man to lock up
his room in that way.

1811. Therefore the distinction which you draw between towns and the
country is, that you think that in the towns the homes would necessarily be
broken up, but in the country that would not follow?
I have no personal experience as a guardian in the country, but that is
my view.

1812. Have you had in St. George's-in-the-East any large number of persons
out of work in the winter, so that you have had to deal with a considerable
mass of applications from able-bodied men at one time for relief?
No, not since the year 1879, when there was a long frost.

1813. In the unions where such a sudden increase of applications from able-
bodied men takes place, do you think it would be possible to dispense entirely
with a labour yard, or some similar arrangement?
I am of Mr. Longley's opinion, that temporary workhouse accommodation
is preferable to labour yards, under such circumstances.

1814. But assuming that it is decidedly preferable that there should be suf-
cient workhouse accommodation, do you think that in the metropolis, for
example, it would be possible to provide such an amount of workhouse accom-
modation as would always meet exceptional cases of large numbers of men being
out of work?
Yes; I should think it would; I should feel prepared myself to face such
a state of things if my board of guardians were willing to provide temporary
accommodation.

1815. But should you object to a power being lodged in the Local Govern-
ment Board to permit, on special occasions, the establishment of a labour yard?
No, I should agree with Mr. Vallance, the very able clerk to the Whitechapel
Board, that inasmuch as the guardians would be, many of them, indisposed to
go to the expense of providing temporary workhouse accommodation, it might
be well for the Local Government Board to have power to do as your Lordship
suggests.

1816. Would there not be some difficulty in providing temporary accommo-
dation with such proper separation of the men, and with such power of
enforcing the rules as would be necessary to keep up a salutary discipline
amongst them?
It would be difficult, but I doubt very much whether in London exceptional
distress such as would necessitate resort to any very exceptional measures would
arise, except in the event of a very long continued frost. The employments in
London are so varied that I do not think we could have anything here like the
Lancashire cotton famine or any general collapse of industry.

§ 1817. As you know well, during the last two or three years a great deal of
attention has been called to what is supposed to be a very exceptional number
of unemployed persons in London; and some persons appear to have been of opinion that the means of the Poor Law, or even of charity, were insufficient to meet the difficulty; could you give us any opinion that you have formed with regard to what I may term the agitation as to the unemployed? 

Yes, I have taken a good deal of interest in it during the last two or three winters. As your Lordships are aware, people have been said to have been absolutely starving; in large numbers, and yet no exceptional measures have been taken, to speak of, and no catastrophe has occurred. I have attended some of these meetings, and in my opinion the working man was conspicuous by his absence. Of the people I saw, in my opinion many belonged to the dangerous classes, roughs and vagrants and loafers; there were a great number of mischievous lads and great numbers of sightseers, who became involved in collision with the police, and who, added to the riotous, became riotous themselves. Very little interest appeared to be taken in the speeches, and people seemed to have gone there evidently for fun and disorder. That was my impression; and as I have mentioned in my statement, that is the opinion of Police Superintendent Sheppard, given before Mr. Justice Charles in the Graham and Burns trial; and Sir Charles Warren stated the same.

1818. Assuming that you are right in your view, that this movement was not one in which the respectable working class took any part, or any conscious part, you would still admit that there were a large number of persons apparently unemployed?

Yes.

1819. How do you think they ought to be dealt with?

By the guardians, I should say, in the way in which we deal with them in St. George's-in-the-East, namely, that the provident among them should be relieved by charity, and that the improvident should be dealt with under the modified workhouse test plan. If there is no test in dealing with improvident able-bodied men in towns, all machinery must, so far as my experience goes, be swamped. It is impossible to deal with the large number which apply. Many of them are intermittently employed, working for no regular master, so that it is impossible to verify their statements, and they take advantage of any relief that may be offered, either with the ineffective work test that can alone be given them, or if relief is given them without a test, then the whole thing becomes a scramble. It seems to me that we had sufficient experience of that in the Mansion House Fund time.

1820. With those men who are intermittently employed, of whom there are always unfortunately a considerable number in all districts, whether town or country, you would deal, I understand, by offering them the workhouse simply?

If they were provident men, they would get relief from charity. If they were improvident, the man would have to take his relief in the workhouse, the family being meanwhile supported by charity according to the above-mentioned St. George's plan, or by out-relief as provided by the Whitechapel order.

1821. But it may be assumed, may it not, that a large number of the men who fall out of work in winter are, from the nature of the case, the men who are, for various reasons, intermittently employed?

Yes.

1822. And such a class as that must contain a considerable number of men who are not very much disposed to work if they can help it?

Quite so.

1823. Had you in St. George's-in-the-East during the period to which we have referred, any special pressure of applications?

Certainly not. Last winter we had decidedly fewer applications than usual.

1824. I suppose that in such a parish as St. George's-in-the-East there must be a considerable number of men who come under the description of men intermittently employed?

An enormous number. To give you an idea of the poverty of St. George's-in-the-East, I may state that at the time of the Mansion House Fund, 29 per cent. of the whole population applied for relief. That was our estimate; when
I say our estimate, I mean that of the Committee of the Mansion House Fund in that district, of which I was a member.

1825. How have those men managed to get through the last two winters? They have a certain number of days' work in the week, and they pawn and sell their things in bad times; and if they are not interfered with and done harm to by charity they help one another very much. They get into debt a little, and wipe it off in the summer. It is a wretched mode of existence; they are extremely poor people, and of course I am very sorry for them; but I feel convinced that there is no mode of really helping them except by helping them to help themselves and to become more provident, especially in regard to early marriages and the size of families. That appears to me to be the cause of much of the poverty that exists.

1826. Have you any means of dealing with that evil which you have described of early marriages and large families? Only by teaching people. It is a subject that is difficult to enter upon, but in my opinion this question of over-population must be faced. I look upon emigration as a mere palliative; I want to go down to the root of the matter, if possible.

1827. Do you think that there is anything that can be done in connection with Poor Law administration which would tend to discourage such improvident marriages? Anything like relief works would encourage people to marry and to set up families. Anything that makes it easy to live without real work and effort encourages this improvidence among the poor. You want to make them think more. The checks, as you may call them, are sufficient in regard to the richer classes for the most part in regard to this matter of early marriages, and so forth; and I think they are not effective in regard to the lower class only because charity is continually stepping in with palliatives and inducing them to forget the future and not to look forward.

1828. Have you observed that during this period of alleged special distress, there has been any great complaint of women being unemployed? No, and that is a significant fact in regard to the agitation, that although it is notorious that women are much worse paid than men, we have had no outcry with regard to them, even by the Socialists, so far as my knowledge goes.

1829. Have you any special employment for women in St. George's-in-the-East? No, we have the ordinary employments, trouser finishing, slipper binding, charing, and other occupations of that kind.

1830. They are very poorly paid, are they not? Yes, and it is a very poor district indeed; I should say, looking at the rateable value, that it is the poorest district that I know in London.

1831. When you say that it is a poor district, you mean that it is not only poor as regards the absence of wealthy people, but poor as regards the character of the labouring population, as compared with the population in other parts of London? Yes, as compared with Whitechapel, for instance. The rateable value per head of population is, in St. George's, 3 l. 17 s.; in Whitechapel, 5 l. 6 s. 6 d.

1832. Do you see any improvement, or the contrary, in the condition and character of your labouring population? As to the actual improvement it is very difficult to speak. Sound principles have prevailed, in regard to the administration of relief, in only a very small area, and we are surrounded by laxly administered unions. I may, perhaps, mention, that an old pawnbroker, who has lived all his life in St. George's, told a friend of mine that he thought the people were more provident, that they made use of savings banks more than of his bank, and that they did not come, as they used to come, every Monday morning to pawn their Sunday clothes until Saturday when they had their wages and could redeem them. He certainly seemed to think that they were more provident than they used to be. Perhaps I may mention that Sir Baldwin Leighton in his pamphlet on dispauperisation
tion gives it as his opinion, that in his strict union of Atcham wages were better than in the surrounding unions; and yesterday a friend of mine quoted to me a letter received from Mr. Bland-Garland, the Chairman of the Bradfield Union, where out-relief is being abolished, in which he said that friendly societies and medical clubs had increased in his union, and he added that pauperism was actually dying out. But I find it very difficult to speak positively in regard to improvement; I can only say that I hope the people are more self-reliant than they were. They certainly manage to get on just as well without the out-door relief dole.

1833. Have you had any or much dissatisfaction expressed amongst the labouring population at the strict administration of the law?

No, they have accepted the inevitable, I may almost say contentedly. I should ascribe that in a great measure to the manner in which we have adhered to our decisions. We have unflinchingly adhered to fixed rules, and we have not permitted interest or importunity to affect our action. Firmness and uniformity are essential for producing an effect upon the habits of the poor. Under the old system which I saw in full work in 1875, no refusal was ever considered to be final. Applicants who were refused would go round to the guardians and make interest with them and the obtaining of out-door relief become, as you may call it, a perfect industry. I am sure this sort of thing goes on wherever out-door relief is given. I may also say that the ease with which this sudden reform was carried out does not appear to me to be so remarkable as at first sight it may seem, for I calculated the other day that in 1874, which was the year before the reform, the out-door relief per pauper per week averaged less than a shilling. I find it is much the same now in unions where out-relief is given. For instance, in 1887 in Bethnal Green the average amount of out-door relief per pauper per week only averaged only 1 s. 3 d., and in Holborn only 1 s. 5 d.

1834. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] What do you mean by averaged? Per pauper, not per head of the population.

1835. Do you think that your system has the support of the respectable working classes who are in a position which does not require them to have recourse to the rates?

I cannot say.

1836. You cannot tell us at all what the opinion of that (I hope) large class is?

I think with regard to the artizan class, that some of them are in favour of a strict administration of the Poor Law. They are sufficiently acquainted with political economy to know that lax Poor Law administration tends to depress wages.

1837. I see you mention in the statement which you have been good enough to give the Committee certain schemes which have been brought forward, as to which you would like to offer some criticisms; the first scheme mentioned here is a proposal for training able-bodied men in country pursuits by means of the Poor Law in homes which has been it appears introduced to the Whitechapel Guardians by the Rev. S. A. Barnett; have you any remarks to make upon that?

I should rather like to leave it to your Lordship to say whether it is worth going into. It appears to me to be hardly worth consideration; it is utterly impracticable.

1838. Then I would ask you with regard to such relief works as were, I understand, undertaken by the Chelsea Vestry, in order to find work for the unemployed; will you describe what those works were?

As far as I can, I will. The relief work carried out by the Chelsea Vestry last year has been quoted as an example to be followed. It is stated that they engaged a number of the unemployed men to do some necessary paving work. If the work was necessary and opportune to the season, there could be no objection to it; but if the Vestry set the work going in order to relieve the men, then they were acting entirely ultra vires. The Vestries are not elected for the (70.) purpose
purpose of giving relief. One would like to know what view of such a proceeding is taken by the regular paviours, who were, to that extent, short of their own work; and I should like to point out that public relief works are, in my opinion, the worst method of relieving the poor. As to the present, public relief works draw to them from both town and country:—(a.) Men intermittently employed and working for no particular master, a very large class in towns. This intermittent employment is a great evil, and public relief works will not cure it. Moreover, as I have stated before, in the case of men intermittently employed, it is impossible to verify their statements. (b.) Men whose trades are always more or less suspended in the winter. Relief works encourage the idea that these men need not save, when work is good, for slack times. (c.) Persons who are under-paid and over-worked. They will all crowd to relief works, but that evil cannot be cured by such methods. (d.) Public relief works will draw to them all the young labour which comes each year on the market, young men who are partially supported by their parents, and who would have in the ordinary course of things to wait some time before they could obtain anything like full wages. The institution of relief works would set all those young men to work, and encourage them to marry and to set up families, and all this at the expense of the ratepayers, many of whom are poor, and have had no better opportunities in life than the paupers themselves. (e.) Relief works afford no test of distress. I should like to draw attention to an instance which occurred in Nottingham, where the Town Council suddenly stopped relief works on account of an adverse report. 1,396 men were discharged and referred to the guardians; only 155 made application. Of these, 56 were dismissed, either because they failed to attend before the Board or were judged not to be in need of relief. 55 were offered the workhouse, and all refused; and of the rest, only 27 accepted the offer of out-door relief, subject to a labour test. This shows how lax the administration of the charity relief works must have been.

1839. Earl of Onslow.] Were the Chelsea Relief Works open to all comers, or were they confined to those who resided in the parish of Chelsea?

I am afraid I do not remember. I have dealt with the objections as to the present; I would ask now to be permitted to say a word as to the objections in the future. If once these public works become a recognised system there is no seeing where it is to stop. It is proposed to order the State to provide works for all comers without the stigma of pauperism. Now, with reference to the public works, I should like to quote Professor Fawcett's opinion. Professor Fawcett wrote at page 59 of his book on pauperism: "The annual loss involved would rapidly augment; population would be powerfully stimulated; voluntary emigration would be checked, and the amount required to supply wages for the increasing number of applicants for work would in time become far more than could be supplied by the resources of any country."

1840. Chairman.] You have stated the objections to relief works started by the Poor Law authorities. Supposing that a certain number of people are of opinion that it would be advantageous to a parish to provide an open space for recreation, and that a large sum of money is subscribed with the view of setting to work a number of people upon such an open space, what do you think is the effect upon the population of such proceedings as those?

I think that charity relief works only intensify the evil, and that they are open to much the same objections as relief works set on foot by the State. They only tend to make the conception of labour permanent at given places.

1841. Have you ever reflected that if the objection is carried to its logical result it would seem to involve the question whether anyone is likely to benefit the labouring population by employing them upon any work which is not productive; and if that be so, are we not landed in one of the most difficult questions of political economy as to what work is productive, and as to what work is likely to be beneficial to the community generally?

We are.

1842. Are you prepared with any answer to those difficulties?

I am afraid I am not. I should say that the test of whether work ought to be given under the circumstances which your Lordship mentions would be the same test as I should apply to the work provided by the Chelsea Vestry, namely:
Is the work given to relieve the men, or because the work is wanted to be done, whether productive or not? If the work was made work for the purpose of relief, I should be against it, and I should say that it would be much better to maintain the men without any work at all, and so give the labour market a chance of readjusting itself.

1843. I will assume that there is some operation which it would be in itself desirable to undertake, because the result of it would be beneficial; but that it would not be undertaken unless from charitable funds, because it could not be shown that the capital expended upon such work would return such a profit as would induce the capitalist to undertake it; do you think that in that case the community would suffer, the result being that work is done which produces something which the community would desire to have, and which would not be done unless the funds were provided by persons who were ready to expend them without an adequate return of profit?

I do not see any objection to that if the work was not got up avowedly for purposes of relief, and if the men were not led to think that it was work made in order to relieve them, and provided the work was carried on in a business-like manner under contractors, and so forth.

1844. I think your opinion would be this: that, of however desirable a nature the work itself may be, it is not expedient that it should be undertaken for the purpose of relieving the unemployed; but that if undertaken it should be so, because it is thought desirable that such work should be performed on its general merits?

That is my opinion.

1845. We have gathered from former evidence that the cases of widows with children are dealt with as a rule in the parish of St. George's-in-the-East by offering the maintenance in the schools which are now built of a certain number of the children whom the widow herself cannot maintain; would you tell us what course you pursue where there is a widow, who from sickness or infirmity, although she is a respectable hard-working person, cannot maintain any of her family?

I was present when my friend, Mr. Pell, answered that question, and I think his answer conveyed a wrong impression. We deal with these cases with the utmost consideration. The guardians would in such an exceptional case as that which your Lordship mentions, take all the children. Then charity would send the woman to a hospital, or to a convalescent home, and do all it possibly could to set her going, and enable her to support herself. If it were a very long case, and charity had to send her away for a long time, we should discontinue to pay her rent, and we should warehouse her furniture. We have accommodation at the Charity Organization Office for that purpose. If the case became incurable, and yet the widow was capable of enjoying life at home, and of taking care of herself, we should then obtain a private pension for her, and the guardians would keep all the children permanently. The pension would be given only in cases of premature breakdown, which could not have been reasonably provided against.

1846. Chairman.] When you speak of a pension, you mean a pension from charitable funds?

Yes; in cases of premature breakdown, the really respectable people who would be injured and degraded by going into the workhouse are never allowed to go there, but are supported by friends or charity.

1847. Then your system absolutely postulates the existence of a charitable organisation who will undertake the maintenance of such widows?

Yes; I do not think that you can thoroughly carry out the relief of distress anywhere without the co-operation of charity; but, in my opinion, although it is most desirable that charity should co-operate with Boards of Guardians, it is not essential. I should, myself, be quite prepared to abolish out-door relief without the aid of organised charity. My view is that the out-door relief system is so utterly demoralising to the character of the poor, that I deliberately would take the risk of a few hard cases arising, rather than continue a practice which, in my opinion, manufactures paupers wholesale, and makes any improvement in the condition of the poor impossible. I may say that when we (70.)
began to restrict out-door relief in St. George's, there was no complete system of organised charity, and that charity was not completely organised for, I should think, eighteen months afterwards. That it is desirable, but not indispensable, is what I should say.

1848. If out-door relief were absolutely abolished, how should you deal with deserving widows with children to support; should you bring them all into the workhouse?

I do not think that they would be allowed to come in. They should be dealt with by their friends or by organised charity.

1849. Then I understand you to mean that you would leave the cases to be dealt with by charitable persons, if such persons came forward?

And by the poor themselves; they would help one another in a wonderful way. I should like to say something as to the steps that I took to see whether the withdrawal of out-relief had produced any undue hardship. Believing, as I did, that the wisdom of the course pursued was fully established, the only question for me was to ascertain whether a sudden change was possible without inflicting undue hardship, and the steps I took to satisfy myself were these: I attended regularly the relief meetings of the Board, and I entered in a note-book the cases that seemed to me hard ones. I waited a week or two, and then visited the homes of these people, and what I saw satisfied me that the hardship was not great. In many instances, I found that the Guardians had been imposed upon, and that the people were better off than was supposed. In others, the relations, friends, or the charitable, had come forward, specially in the cases of widows with children, and in sick cases; in others, energy had been aroused, and better work obtained. Very few had migrated, and those who had could not obtain out-door relief, because they would not have been eligible under a year's residence, and comparatively few, only about one-third, accepted the test offer of the district pauper schools. I should like to emphasise that I visited all those who had not accepted, with the result that I have described. I may say that I was an active member of the Charity Organisation Society; I was in frequent communication with the relieving officers, the clergy, and their workers, and I was constantly in the parish, and if there had been any great suffering I must have become aware of it.

1850. Take for example the case of a widow who is left in the family-way by her husband, and who has no relations or friends who can support her; would you force such a widow as that into the workhouse, although it might be quite apparent that as soon as ever she got over her trouble she would, in all probability, be able to maintain herself?

If it was an ordinary case, and not a specially deserving one, we should oblige her to be confined in the infirmary, and we should keep up her rent by charity while she was there. When she came out, we should help her by charity for a few weeks to float her off into employment.

1851. Does not that seem to assume that the Poor Law is to be relieved of the duty of maintaining those persons, and why should not the ratepayers undertake the support of this particular class of poor persons as compared with others?

It is often contended that those are just the sort of cases that out-door relief, and not private charity, ought to be extended to. I strongly dissent from this view, and I should like to be allowed to give my reasons. The handing over of exceptional cases of distress by the rich to the State for relief appears to me to be contrary to Christian principles. State relief can evoke no real gratitude on the part of the poor who know that they have a right to it in some form, and that it costs the dispensers of it nothing, and it calls forth no sympathy or kindly intercourse on the part of the rich, who are, by its existence, in the out-door form, simply enabled to evade their responsibilities.

1852. Why does it apply to these cases specially? Every case may be said to be deserving, or otherwise, in which rich persons might reasonably be called upon to assist; but I suppose it does not follow that because a man or woman is undeserving they are to be left to starve. The State has taken charge under our system of all cases of that kind, and the very principle of it is not to throw
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the burden specially upon any one class of the community, but upon all; upon what principle would you advocate the abolition of that system?

I think that the ratepayers, many of whom are poor and struggling, have thrown upon them all that ought to be thrown upon them compulsorily in the payment of the cost of in-door relief.

1853. You quite understand that I am not in the slightest degree suggesting that a system of out-door relief is a desirable one; but I am merely putting it to you, as strongly as I can, whether there are not some cases in which it is so obviously oppressive to cause persons to come into the workhouse, that a well administered Poor Law must have some scope for exception?

I will take, if you will allow me, the case of the widow about to be confined. If she is a respectable deserving widow, she ought not to be brought into contact with the Poor Law more than can be helped, and cases of exceptional misfortune appear to me to be cases for charity. I should quote the Poor Law Commissioners, who said this: “Where cases of real hardship occur, the remedy must be applied by individual charity, a virtue for which no system of compulsory relief can or ought to be a substitute;” and they also say: “That the whole of all pauper legislation has been the legislating for extreme cases, and that every exception, every violation of the general rule to meet a real case of unusual hardship lets in a whole class of fraudulent cases, by which that rule must in time be destroyed.” With those principles I thoroughly agree. In the case of a deserving widow, such as your Lordship described, the guardians would deal with it without undue hardship, even if there were no organised charity, and without giving out-door relief, by warehousing the furniture, and taking the widow into the workhouse until she was confined. This is occasionally done in some unions.

1854. Has it never occurred to you that if an attempt was made to enforce such general principles as you describe without exception, it would cause an universal revolt against the administration of the Poor Law?

That is the difficulty, the difficulty of agitation.

1855. Do you not think that it would cause a revulsion of feeling which would probably break down the administration if it were carried on upon such principles?

My opinion is, that if out-door relief were abolished throughout the country, charity would receive such an impetus that it would come forward sufficiently to meet the difficulty.

1856. Then, in point of fact, you would so modify the Poor Law as to confine the relief given from the rates to relief given in a manner which was distasteful, and intended to be distasteful, to those who applied for it?

I should.

1857. By a deserving widow you would mean, I presume, a respectable woman who had done her best to maintain herself, and who was likely to be so in the future; by an undeserving widow you would mean a thriftless person who was not perhaps of very good character, and who obviously would not do more than she was absolutely obliged to do to maintain herself?

Yes; and I should lay great stress upon the home being clean and decent.

1858. All that you have said upon this subject implies, I think, that it is highly desirable that there should be some organized system of charity to deal with these cases?

Yes.

1859. I understand that St. George’s-in-the-East to a considerable extent you have such an organization?

Yes, I consider that it is complete. We give too much, in fact, in my opinion.

1860. In your opinion is it very desirable that such organizations should be in communication with the Poor Law authorities?

Yes, decidedly, otherwise there would be overlapping of relief.

(70.)
1861. I rather gather from an observation which you just dropped that you feel some apprehension, lest if these charitable organizations were not conducted upon strict principles, they might give rise to very much the same evils as indiscriminate out-door relief; is that your view? I should say that indiscriminate charity was very mischievous, but not so demoralising as out-door relief; and moreover, where charity was very badly administered I should hope that the funds would very soon come to an end. The Poor Law relief can be reckoned upon and charity cannot. Where out-door relief is given favouritism is sure to creep in. Guardians abuse their position to obtain relief either for their or their friend's dependents, or poor relations. I mentioned in my statement that a friend of mine was present at an East-end board of guardians when a guardian brought before the board for relief four of his tenants. Of course it was looked upon as a joke; there was a good deal of laughter, and the tenants did not get relief. Another guardian told a friend of mine the other day, that in his union there is no difficulty in getting out-door relief if the applicant is known to any of the guardians. All these appear to me to be reasons why even ill-managed charity is less harmful than out-door relief.

1862. How would you deal with the case of persons who are suffering from some very serious physical infirmity, as for example blindness, or who have met with some very severe accident which entirely incapacitates them from work? I understand your Lordship to be referring to cases of premature affliction.

1863. I will take the case of blindness coming upon a very respectable hard working man, with possibly a family, at an early period of life when it would have been impossible for him to have made an adequate provision; or the case of a man, who, early in life perhaps unmarried, met with a severe accident, making it absolutely impossible that from that time he ever could maintain himself. In St. George's-in-the-East, when such obviously hard cases go into the workhouse, charity obtains a pension for them, whenever a decent home can be obtained with friends or relations. We take all such cases out of the workhouse as soon as our attention is drawn to them.

1864. I apprehend that you advocate the restriction or abolition of out-door relief upon the sound principle that if you encourage men to expect in their old age or sickness that they will get relief from the rates they will never make the necessary exertions to provide for those contingencies themselves; but supposing that the contingency is one which no man can foresee, what evil results can come to the community by relieving such cases? Is it possible to suppose that anyone will incur a very bad accident for the purpose of getting relief; and why should not such cases as those be relieved by out-relief?

1865. I thoroughly agree with your Lordship that they ought to be relieved outside the workhouse, but not by the Poor Law. It is very dangerous to allow boards of guardians, as at present constituted, to exercise what practically amounts to patronage at the expense of the rates. If guardians once undertake to deal with hard cases exceptionally, the exceptions are certain, before long, to break down the rule.

1866. What evil results can come from their being relieved by the Poor Law? It is the business and duty of the rich to take up the cases of exceptional misfortune.

1867. I thoroughly agree in the argument that out-door relief tends to destroy the provident habits of the poor; but I put the case of misfortune, which no man, poor or otherwise, could foresee, and could have been reasonably expected to provide against. Inasmuch as no one could foresee it, and therefore no one could have made any calculation based upon the possibility of its happening, why should out-door relief from the rates produce any evil effect to the community.

I think it would be degrading to the recipient. I consider that in such a case as your Lordship mentions improvidence would not be encouraged for the reasons which I have just given; but I think that such a case ought to be dealt with by the personal care and sympathy of the rich; that ladies, for instance, should take up
up and visit, and sympathise with and advise, and comfort people, just as our ladies do in the cases relieved by the Tower Hamlets Pension Committee.

1857. It may no doubt be in itself a better mode of administering the relief that it should come from kind and charitable persons who look into the cases themselves; but why should there be anything degrading to a man in the receipt of support from the whole community in cases of undeserved misfortune? Why is that more degrading than in the case where a maimed soldier receives a pension from the State?

I think that the State and others ought to pay their employees sufficient to enable them to save, and not treat them rather like children by giving them pensions.

1868. Earl of Milltown.] Why should it be more degrading to these deserving persons to accept relief from poor rates than from private charity?

Because many of these ratepayers are so poor and struggling that it seems very hard upon them. I should put myself in the position of the man that has been described: I should not feel it a degradation to receive a pension, or to receive help from my own relations, or from my own friends; but I should feel it very hard if the community were saddled with my maintenance.

1869. But supposing that you had been as this man probably would have been, a ratepayer all your life, surely there would be nothing degrading in the event of sudden misfortune in your coming upon that fund to which you had been a contributor all your life?

That would not recommend itself to me as a reason. I should think it very degrading to be connected with the relieving officer and the workhouse paytable, and with the people who crowd to the relief office, the very dregs of the population. One has only to look into a relief office, even where no out-door relief is given, except medical relief, to see in the waiting-rooms what low people go there; and one would not subject anybody for whom one had real respect to mix with such people.

1870. You say that it is the business and duty of the rich to take up such exceptional cases; but supposing that they do not do it, what then?

I should leave the responsibility with them.

1871. But in the meantime the unfortunate man could suffer very considerably?

That is not my experience. I believe that just as it has happened in St. George’s-in-the-East, so it would happen everywhere; that you have only to force the hand of charity and it will come forward. That I may state I know to be the opinion of Mr. Llewellyn Davies, a man of immense experience, who was examined before your Lordships the other day.

1872. Chairman.] Are you of opinion that any fresh legislation would be desirable as regards the Poor Law?

I am of opinion that it is hopeless to look for much improvement, unless the present too wide discretion of the guardians is curtailed. Legislation and the orders of the Local Government Board are required to make general and permanent the progress that has already been made. I have been struck with the Elberfeld system of nominating qualified persons as almoners, and although I do not think that it would be possible in the present state of politics to nominate guardians to any great extent, I should be glad if our Local Government Board could nominate more than they do. I would suggest that a magistrate should have a seat on any one guardian board in the petty sessional division in which he acts as justice. I am a magistrate for Middlesex, and am an ex-officio guardian in Marylebone where I live; I want to work in St. George’s-in-the-East, which is in the Petty Sessional Division in which I act, but I have no ex-officio seat as a guardian there. I am also of opinion that the 40 l. a year rating qualification in London for a guardian nominated by the Local Government Board, should be dispensed with. I agree with Mr. Pell that guardians should have the power of passing bye-laws to secure uniformity of practice which should have the force of orders, and not, as at present, be liable
liable to be set aside by a chance division at an ill-attended Board meeting. I may add that the Poor Law Commissioners were of opinion that legislation is necessary to secure the continuance of progress made. They say: "Here and there an extraordinary man will come into office and succeed very satisfactorily, but when he goes, there is generally an immediate relapse into the old system." As your Lordship is aware, that is strictly the case with the two unions of Southwell and Bingham, which were the model instances upon which the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 was founded.

1873. Is there any other change in the law which you would suggest; would you have the elections annually or at longer periods?

I would have them held triennially; we are elected triennially.

1874. You would be in favour generally of triennial elections?

Yes; and on the whole I should prefer that one-third of the guardians went out every year, as is the case in vestries and district boards of works.

1875. In advocating as you do the abolition of out-door relief, do you think that that end should be attained gradually so as not to cause hardship?

My opinion is that each class of cases should be dealt with simultaneously, thus the poor would accept the new rule more contentedly. In St. George's-in-the-East instead of doing that we dealt with the various classes of cases as they came up for renewal of relief, and we had some difficulty in consequence, especially with widows having dependent children. A widow would say, "Why am I to have my relief stopped; Mrs. So and-so has got hers for so many more weeks; why shouldn't I have it?" In regard to the permanent list, which comprises mostly aged people, I should advise, that after carefully revising the list, the remaining cases should continue to have relief as long as they lived, but that no new cases should be put on.

1876. Earl of Aberdeen.] Is it not the case that many working men even have an increased dislike to going to church for fear they should be supposed to be going there for the purpose of obtaining charitable relief in the way that some do?

That is my opinion, that the association of religion and relief by ministers of religion creates many hypocrites, and alienates the working man, as your Lordship has just said, from having anything to do with places of worship. I should like to mention that a clergyman in Southwark the other day, in a printed circular, stated that the proper way to approach the working man was to go to him with a free gospel on your lips and a quarter loaf under your arm. That was his estimate of the character of the working class.

1877. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Can you give me the name of that wise person; he must live in my diocese, and I should like to make his acquaintance? I cannot give you his name.

1878. You are not sure whether he is a clergyman of the Church of England?

I cannot say for certain, but I believe he is. The extraordinary thing is that this should be stated in a printed circular; but my experience is, that the practice is not far removed from that in many cases.

1879. Chairman.] From your experience in St. George's-in-the-East, do you think that a similar system could be safely applied in all parts of London and in other populous places?

I do distinctly; and I should like to quote Mr. Longley, late Metropolitan Inspector of the Local Government Board, upon that point. He said in his 1873 Report: "The workhouse system is invariably applicable, and no special conditions of locality, trade, weather, or population interfere with its universal applicability."

1880. That is Mr. Longley's opinion, but what is your own?

My opinion is distinctly the same as his.

1881. Earl of Milltown.] I understand you to say with regard to the workhouse
house test, that you would only apply it provided that you could apply the
modified workhouse test in certain instances?
Where there is a decent home, yes.

1882. Otherwise you think it would work considerable hardship?
I will not say that, but I do think there is a grievance which requires to be
met. I do not believe that homes are broken up at all often even under the
present system.

1883. But at the same time you think there is a grievance otherwise, and the
only way you see to meet that grievance is to adopt in certain cases a modified
workhouse test?
Yes.

1884. You said just now that it was the business and the duty of the rich to
take up cases of exceptional distress; how do you substantiate that statement?
I should refer to the New Testament.

1885. It is entirely then on Christian grounds that you base that argument?
Yes, on religious grounds.

1886. You do not mean that it is the duty of the citizen apart from his
Christian feelings?
I cannot myself very well separate the notion of duty from religion.

1887. With regard to the agitation which occurred in the early part of this
year, I understand that, in your opinion, it did not arise from stress of weather
or any such cause?
That is my opinion; certainly not from stress of weather.

1888. What do you think was the most provoking cause?
The remarks which were made in Parliament with reference to the casuals
sleeping in Trafalgar Square.

1889. Do you think that the late Mansion House Fund had something to do
with it?
Yes; I think that the riots, the Mansion House Fund, and the enumeration of
the unemployed by the Government, all tended to make the people look to the
State and expect, that something was to be done for them, and to clamour for
it accordingly.

1890. Which do you think is more likely to pauperise, out-door relief or in-
door relief?
Out-door relief.

1891. Would you shortly give your reasons for thinking so?
Because that which really pauperises is that which makes people depend upon
others and not upon themselves; the less agreeable the form of relief is the
less incentive there is to rely upon it, and the greater motive there is to effort
and self-help.

1892. And that is your reason, I presume, for wishing relief to be as little
agreeable as possible to the recipient?
It is entirely in the interest of the poor themselves.

1893. You have had very considerable experience personally amongst the
poor, I think?
I have; I am in the habit of visiting them. Not only do I attend the Board
as a guardian, but every week I visit people at their homes.

1894. With regard to the question, whether it is more or less economical to
the rates to administer out-door relief; it is very often said that it is cheaper to
give a person 4 s. a week out-door relief than to pay 10 s. a week for him in the
workhouse; that is the ratepayer's argument frequently; what do you say to
that?
I believe that that is the chief reason why ratepayers are in favour of out-
door relief. They think it is cheaper to give out-door relief than to offer the
workhouse. In answer to your Lordship's question, I cannot do better than
quote Mr. Wodehouse, the late Local Government Board Inspector, who is now
Assistant Secretary of the Local Government Board. At page 11 of his 1873
(70.)
Report on Out-Door Relief in the country, he says, "As regards the argument which proceeds upon the ground of economy, I believe that its fallacy may very readily be shown by a simple arithmetical process. A family applies for relief; if they are given out-door relief to the amount of 4 s. a week they will be satisfied; if they come into the workhouse their maintenance will cost 10 s. a week. The economists therefore argue that by giving out relief they will save 6 s. a week. Now, the very same guardians who have used this argument, have frequently acknowledged to me that when the workhouse test is offered it is not accepted in more than one case out of 10. By offering the workhouse then in such cases the guardians would indeed lose 6 s. a week in the one case in which it was accepted, but in each of the remaining nine cases they would save 4 s., so that their total gain upon the 10 cases would amount to 30 s. a week." That appears to me to be a complete exposure of the fallacy.

1895. It would be very advantageous, would it not, if the ratepayers could have it clearly brought before them?

It would, I think, be very advantageous.

1896. Because the ultimate decision will rest with them as to in-door relief or out-door relief?

Yes.

1897. I believe you are anxious to put in evidence some figures with regard to the amount of charity which has been distributed in St. George's-in-the-East through the means of the Charity Organisation Society?

Yes; I should like to say that the burden thrown upon charity in this very poor parish of 47,000 people has not been great, and yet the Committee have never to my knowledge allowed a single approved case to go unrelieved. In the year 1884-85 the amount of relief given through the Charity Organisation Committee was 657 l. to 402 people. In the year 1885-86, which was the Mansion House Fund year, when the poor were in a state of speculative ferment; and were encouraged to besiege all relief agencies, the amount of relief was 819 l., given to 621 applicants. In the year 1886-87 770 l. was given to 490 applicants. In addition to these sums I may mention that the Tower Hamlets Pension Committee has spent about 250 l. in each of these years in our district. I should like to add that a great part of the Charity Organisation relief was obtained through the clergy and the local almoners of the Society for the Relief of Distress; and I may mention that the sum expended in out-door relief under the old system was, in the year 1871, 8,916 l., and in 1874, 4,391 l.

1898. Do you think that that represents anything like the whole of the charity given away in the district?

A large part of it, I should say; it is a very poor district. I expressed the opinion just now that we are giving too much to the poor through charity.

1899. Do the funds come principally from the parish itself to those charities, or from without?

Chiefly from without. I think that it is only just, especially in London, where the rich live apart from the poor, that rich districts should come to the aid of poor districts; I am not dissatisfied with the amount contributed in the parish itself.

1900. Earl Spencer.] I understand you to say that you think that charity organisation may sometimes be too lavish in what it does for the poor, and that it may do harm in that way?

I do.

1901. But I understand that you consider that it does not do so much harm when it operates in that direction as out-door relief would?

No, not nearly so much harm as out-door relief.

1902. Would you explain that a little more in detail?

Charity is not so demoralising; it cannot be reckoned upon in the same way; it is not drawn from very poor ratepayers compulsorily. All those sort of reasons, I think, apply as showing that charity is better than compulsory relief.

1903. And
1903. And you think that a proper organisation of charity could be got up in any parish where the out-door relief is almost discontinued.

I would rather confine myself to London and populous places. I should say that it could in populous places.

1904. You think there would be no difficulty in getting those who would administer it wisely and prudently?

There would no doubt be some difficulty.

1905. To carry on this subject a little, has your attention been turned to the influence of the large hospitals in London on the poor?

I do not know that I have any information, derived from personal experience, to give upon that subject. The one thing that has struck me is this: that there is no proper distinction at the London Hospital between Workhouse-infirmary cases and hospital cases.

1906. Has the out-door system of the hospitals, therefore, any demoralising effect upon the poor?

Yes, I think it has; but our parish is so poor that I do not know that the evils there come out so glaringly as they would in a parish where there are more artizans.

1907. But even among the poor are there not attempts to get up provident clubs for their wives and children besides those for themselves?

Yes, to a certain extent. I do not know of any women's club in St. George's.

1908. Do you know of any children's club?

No, except for burial. There is a Boy Foresters' Club connected with one of the lodges of that society.

1909. Are there no medical clubs?

Not to my knowledge.

1910. Has there been any attempt made to get them up?

Yes, we made an attempt some years ago, but it failed.

1911. Why did it fail?

I think partly because of the proximity of the London Hospital, and partly because of the rather indiscriminate way in which our relieving officers give orders for the parish dispensary. We do not have our medical order applications before the board. We tried it once, but the applications were so numerous that we could not continue it.

1912. Do you never review the medical orders at any period of the year?

No, we do not. If a man in work with, say a wife and one child, applied for medical relief, the relieving officer would give him an order to attend before the board; but as a rule relieving officers grant medical relief I should say too easily.

1913. Do you think that there has been an abuse of that power?

I should say that there has been.

1914. Have you ever considered how you could remedy that?

I have no doubt that if our board would take the trouble to have all the cases up before them, as they do at Whitechapel, we should make a great difference in the number.

1915. You never thought that the abuse was so great that it was necessary that you should do that?

I do not think that our board would give the time; I do not think it is practicable with our particular board.

1916. Have there been any abuses connected with the improved infirmary accommodation for the poor in your parish?

I have no doubt that the people are attracted into these extremely well-managed workhouse infirmaries more than they used to be. In our workhouse infirmary we have two good doctors, kind attentive men, and we have a lady matron, and now we are going in for trained nurses from the (70.) institution.
institution. All these improvements do, no doubt, attract people into the infirmaries who could get on by the help of their relations, and who could be well attended to at home. I cannot state any special instances that have come to my knowledge.

1917. Have you much experience of the system with regard to the casual poor?

No. I have come to the conclusion from the inquiries that have been made, that it is almost hopeless to attempt to set the homeless on their feet again. The superintendent of our casual ward has frequently informed me that all the people who come there (it is in a very out-of-the-way place close to the river), are old-stagers, known to him, and that he does not think anything can be done for them.

1918. You have a casual ward in St. George's?

We have, I am sorry to say.

1919. But you do not approve of it?

I do not. I think that casual wards, refuges, soup kitchens, free meals, and all those things that make it easier for the indolent to live, attract people to London and pauperise them, that is to say, make them think that others will provide for them, and that they need not provide for themselves.

1920. How would you meet the case of a wayfarer who wants a night's lodging if you did away with your casual ward altogether?

If the master of the workhouse was convinced that the man was a bona fide wayfarer, he would let him out early the next morning.

1921. But might not that increase the number, because I understand that you do retain them as casuals for two nights, whereas if a man goes into the workhouse you have no power of retaining him at all?

The power of the guardians as to detention would have to be increased; and as it is we require increased power of detention, in order to deal properly with what are called ins and outs who are a great nuisance in all London workhouses.

1922. How would you propose to alter the law in order to meet that difficulty?

My opinion is of very little value in the matter. I agree with what Mr. Hedley said the other day, abolish the distinction and give the guardians increased power of detention, with discretion to the master of the workhouse; but he has that now.

1923. He has not the power of keeping a man who comes in?

No; I mean give him discretion to break through the rule of detention, and to let a bona fide wayfarer leave the workhouse without detaining him.

1924. You referred to what you called a good deal of hypocrisy in the way of obtaining relief, and you seemed to connect it with the ministers of religion. I did not quite understand why you brought that forward; have you any proposal to make with regard to that, or was it only a general remark?

I am a strong advocate for all relief being administered by laymen.

1925. But clergymen, I presume, do assist a great deal in finding out cases and so on?

I quite approve of their giving information as to the people living in their parishes. It is their administering the relief that I object to. Two or three valuable members of our Charity Organisation Committee are clergymen, but I should prefer that they had nothing to do with relief. Of course that is their affair. One is glad to get their co-operation if they think it right to give it, but I do not myself approve of the clergy or ministers of any denomination having anything to do with relief; I think it injures the cause of religion very much.

1926. You would like their co-operation for giving information, but not in the actual administration of relief?

Quite so.
1927. Lord Thring.] You have been asked, with regard to the duty of the rich to the poor, is it not a duty of natural religion, quite apart from Christianity, that citizens should assist one another?

Certainly.

1928. You have constantly used the term "a man intermittently employed"; do you consider that those people who are intermittently employed are necessarily improvident; is it a sign of an improvident man that he has not continuous employment?

Not always; certainly not in our district where the men depend so much upon the docks.

1929. You mentioned pawnbroking. I am very curious upon this point; is the pawnbroking system a hardship upon the poor, which would be relieved by having a charitable system of pawnbroking, or charitable loans; in other words, would you recommend, as a good form of charity, a large pawnbroking charitable society, taking the security of goods for a quasi loan?

My experience of pawnbrokers is that they are kind, respectable men. I know several in St. George's. I do not think that the present system works hardly at all, but my opinion upon the point is not worth much.

1930. With regard to rotation of guardians, you said that you approve of the continuity being kept up by their not going out all at once, and you mentioned triennial rotation, as it is usually called; would you or would you not prefer that one-third of the guardians should go out every two years so as to prevent an annual election?

Yes, I should prefer that to triennial rotation.

1931. Chairman.] But are you quite certain that all guardians would prefer that system?

I should think that the guardians themselves would prefer it.

1932. Have you observed such great anxiety on the part of people to be guardians that they would welcome any very long period of office?

In St. George's, I think the guardians are anxious to remain on the board.

1933. Lord Thring.] Do not the Charity Organisation Society lend money? I personally do not approve of loans; and in St. George's we have almost entirely dis-continued the system of loans on security. We often say to a man, "We will lend you these couple of pounds; we believe in you, and we put you upon your honour, and if you can repay us, do."

1934. Do you object to that?

No, only to loans on security.

1935. Why?

Because it looks like a business transaction, and it really is not. We never feel able to enforce payment by prosecution.

1936. You think it is a sort of hypocrisy?

Yes.

1937. You talked of early marriages as being a great evil, and we have had testimony that the children of these early marriages are (I think the phrase used by a Witness was) anaemic, by which I understand feeble in health. These children are compelled to go to school, and we have the testimony of a Witness that education was absolutely injurious to them on account of, as I understood it, the infirmity and weakness of their bodies. But this weakness has been relieved in many cases by free breakfasts and free dinners, which are supplied from charity. With your great experience, I wish to know, first of all, whether you object to free breakfasts, or free dinners provided by charity, and given to children under the circumstances which I suggest?

In principle of course I am against it. In practice it is very difficult to oppose it.

1938. If you disapprove of their being free altogether, do you also disapprove (70.)
of the more modified form of free meals, which disguises, as it were, the freedom in which they give the children farthing breakfasts (which is one of the instances given to the Committee), halfpenny dinners, and also penny dinners, the penny dinners being under certain circumstances?

It is, of course, against all my principles, but I think that if it were really carefully managed, and if a doctor's certificate were made obligatory in each case, "This child is not fit to attend school unless it is better nourished," and if proper inquiries were made as to the ability of the parents to support the child, I should hardly like to say that I should be against it.

1930. It is a matter of fact, I know, that in a great many schools the children come in insufficiently fed, and that there is no means of providing them with sufficient food, and that they do not bring sufficient food with them; under those circumstances, would you, or would you not, think it right to give them free or partially free dinners?

I personally could not have anything to do with the system.

1940. You think that it would degrade the poor?

I am afraid so. The poor are so apt to spend more of their money in improper ways if they are relieved of part of their responsibilities.

1941. Supposing that you could make the penny dinners pay their expenses, you would not object, I suppose, to setting them up through charity?

No; if they can be made to do so by management and by buying goods in large quantities.

1942. But, upon the whole, you would be against relieving those poor children and placing their bodies in a sufficient state to enable them to receive education?

Without payment. I think that the penny dinners possibly might not do much harm, because the schooling, of course, is not paid for on business-like principles, and yet I do not know that it pauperises the people. I do not know why they should not pay a little for their dinners.

1943. As you know, the guardians often allow the school fees; do you consider that right or wrong?

I should be against it.

1944. How can you justify the State compelling children to be sent to school if those children are, in fact, to be killed or greatly injured by the education?

These are great difficulties, I admit, and I do not feel competent to answer the question on the spur of the moment. Perhaps there is no answer.

1945. You have formed no opinion upon that dilemma, for dilemma it is?

No, it is a difficult subject to form an opinion upon, I think. One's sympathies are all with giving dinners to hungry children.

1946. Would you object to charity doing it, or what would you suggest?

I can conceive of the safeguards being of such a nature as to make it, perhaps, justifiable.

1947. From your experience, what would you recommend as safeguards to a system of free meals, or quasi free meals?

Proper inquiry is one thing; I do not know that I can make any suggestion beyond that.

1948. Then I may take it that with proper inquiry we may be allowed to consider that your opinion would not be very hostile to free meals, or quasi free meals, under the circumstances?

Yes, I think that my opinion would not be very hostile.

1949. Earl of Hopetoun.] You mentioned that early marriages amongst the poor were very frequent in the East End, and that they led to great evils; do you not think that a man becomes more provident and more alive to his responsibilities when he is married?

He may do so, but it is too late to prevent an early marriage and a probable large family.

1950. But he may try to save, and be more anxious to get more work, and be more industrious?
It may have that effect upon some people, or it may make them reckless in other cases; but there is the fact that you have this enormous increase of population, which is in my opinion at the root of the evil of want of employment.

1951. Do you not think that if these early marriages were stopped you would probably have even greater evils in regard to vice?

Possibly, but I should not feel myself responsible for any abuses that might arise if the measures that were taken were right and proper.

1952. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Perhaps you are not aware that in many parishes the clergy, as a rule, never administer relief personally, but always employ lay persons for doing it?

Yes, I am. That is a very good plan, I think.

1953. Do you consider it unsuitable for ministers of religion, privately or publicly, to invite the aid of their congregations, and that that is likely to prejudice the working class against the Christian religion?

No, I think, if the funds are actually administered by, say, a parochial council.

1954. I am afraid that the poor would be a great deal worse off if the ministers of religion did not invite the contributions of their congregations?

No doubt.

1955. Earl of Jersey.] I understood you to say that you were in favour of a system of nominated guardians?

Yes.

1956. Do you find any jealousy on the part of elected guardian towards nominated guardians?

Very little. I may say that I was subjected to a certain amount of good-natured banter upon first being put upon the St. George's-in-the-East Board by the Local Government Board.

1957. Do you think that a nominated guardian would be able to introduce a change in the system as well as an elected guardian?

Yes, I think so, if he were really working at the subject, and were thought to wish to do the best for the poor. Good work is recognised by the class of men who are guardians of the poor districts of London.

1958. Quite irrespective of whether they are elected or nominated?

Yes, if they do not presume upon their position. If they give themselves airs in any way, that is fatal in the East-end of London.

1959. Earl of Strafford.] Have you taken any interest in the question of the boarding-out of pauper children?

Yes, but I have no personal experience in regard to it.

1960. Do you prefer their being boarded out in private homes, or their being educated in the large pauper district, or workhouse schools?

I should like to say that the St. George's Board of Guardians have set their faces against boarding out, because since the Roman Catholic children have been removed to Roman Catholic schools, there have been a great many vacancies at their own school. I approve highly of the system of boarding out outside the Union for double orphans and deserted children, especially if they are sent right away, say to Windermere, from their old haunts and relations. I think it dissociates them from pauperism, and they are more easily merged in the general population; they have the benefit of family life instead of institution life, and above all often a permanent home and affection from their foster parents all through their after life.

1961. From what you have either heard or seen upon the subject, do you think that the supervision is adequate with regard to the children who are boarded out in private homes?

I should not like to offer any opinion upon that point.
1962. But upon the whole you prefer the home life to the workhouse life for those children? Yes, and the removal of the permanent children from the contamination of the casual children.

1963. Earl of Aberdeen.] Is there not a considerable class of men who, though not especially wanting in thrift, are wanting in physical strength, and are therefore the first to be discharged from employment when the employer, as must frequently be the case, wishes to reduce the number of his hands? Yes, no doubt.

1964. What would you suggest as to the mode of dealing with such people? I can only suggest that the Poor Law should deal with them in the manner I have described, i.e., by means of a modified workhouse test. I do not think that the Poor Law can discriminate. Exceptional cases should be dealt with by charity, not by the Poor Law.

1965. Is there any disposition, so far as you know in the surrounding unions, to adopt the system which has been worked in St. George's-in-the-East? In Poplar there is a certain disposition, and in Mile End there was while two or three friends of mine were guardians there. Now that they have gone off the board of guardians, I believe that a lax system has been re-introduced.

1966. With regard to the operations at Chelsea to which you referred, would not the work so given have been equally open to the objection that it might deprive independent workmen of getting employment, even if it was required and seasonable? Yes, I think it is hard upon the paviours, for instance, that paving should be given to unemployed persons who are not paviours.

1967. But I think you mentioned that if it was really required and the season was appropriate, you would not have regarded it as objectionable? No; I do not know that I should. If the work were set on foot to relieve the men, and not because it was necessary, then I should say that it was objectionable. It is obvious that if men who are not paviours are employed to do paving, the object must have been relief.

1968. Referring to what you said about the Gospel and the loaf, I suppose you would sympathise with the difficulty which meets district visitors and others going among the poor in this respect; that it often seems a mockery to speak to them about improvement, or about religion, when they are in bodily want? I do not think there need be any difficulty about that. If I were a district visitor I should arrange with the clergyman that I should have nothing whatever to do with relief. I should then, in visiting the poor, tell them that I was pledged to have nothing to do with relief, and that therefore all I could do would be to offer them my sympathy, and personal work, and trouble, and so forth.

1969. Have you noticed any sign on the part of the ratepayers of preferring the election of guardians who were opposed to such schemes as relief works and lax administration in any way? No, I am afraid that what operates in the election of guardians are local considerations which have nothing to do with their qualifications for Poor Law administration, as a rule.

1970. Earl Spencer.] Politics? Yes, chiefly. Also the public importance of deciding contracts, &c.

1971. Lord Thring.] Supposing that a layman goes round as a Scripture reader, or in any other quasi religious or entirely religious character, you would dissociate him, though a layman, from relief? Certainly, I should wish to do so.


The Witness is directed to withdraw.
Miss MARIANNE HARRIET MASON, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

1973. Chairman.] You are the Local Government Board Inspector of boarded-out children?
Yes.

1974. How long have you held that appointment?
Nearly two years and-a-half.

1975. Before that you had paid, I think, a great deal of attention to that subject?
Yes, for a long while.

1976. What is the extent of your district?
England and Wales, wherever there are certified committees.

1977. How many certified committees have you to deal with?
There are 120 on the register now.

1978. Those are all committees for superintending children who are boarded out away from the unions to which they belong?
Yes; under a special order; that of 1870.

1979. You have nothing to do with the children who are boarded out by the boards of guardians within their unions?
No, nothing.

1980. Can you tell us the rules as to the formation of a certified committee, and the mode in which it is formed?
When any benevolent persons in a particular neighbourhood think that they would like to receive some pauper children from London, or from any of the large unions, they write to the Local Government Board, submitting their names and saying who they are, giving references, if necessary; and then, if the Local Government Board think fit, they send them down a form of undertaking which they sign, declaring that they will comply with the Board's regulations, and then the Board give them a written form of authority. I have brought the forms with me (producing them). The Board send them down directions how to form their committee. Then if they form their committee, the Board send them the "Form of Undertaking of Boarding-out Committee," and if they accept them they send them the "Form of Written Authority." Then they are entitled to receive children from all the unions which are under the schedule of the Boarding-out Order of 1870; that is to say, if the guardians choose to send children to them, they may; but whenever they send them children they must first of all draw up an agreement form stating the scale of payments, and so on, which must first be submitted to the Local Government Board.

1981. And then, of course, the foster-parents have to sign an agreement in the form supplied?
Yes; each foster-parent signs an agreement with the guardians, a duplicate of which must be forwarded by the guardians to the Local Government Board.

1982. One of the conditions, I believe, is that the foster-parents shall be of the same religion as that to which the child belongs?
Yes.

1983. Is there any limitation as to the distance from the union from which those children are sent?
None; it may be anywhere in England and Wales, so long as it is a duly certified committee.

1984. Is there any limitation as to the distance from the residences of the committee?
Yes, the regulation is that no child may be at a greater distance than five (70.) miles
miles from some member of the committee, and it is recommended that the
distance shall be less.

1985. Are all these 120 committees now receiving children?
No; there are about, I think, 28 without children at this moment, so far as I
know.

1986. Is there no limitation as to the number of children which they may
take?
There is no limitation as to the number which the committee may take, but
there is a limitation as to the number which the foster-parent may take.

1987. Each foster-parent may take how many?
Only two, except in the case of brothers and sisters, and even in the case of
brothers and sisters it must only be four.

1988. Can you give us the total number of children who are boarded out
under the superintendence of these committees?
There were 1,172 by the last report, and more have been sent out since.

1989. What are the class of children who are eligible for boarding out?
This is the rule of the Poor Law Board as to boarding out: "No child shall
be boarded out unless such child is an orphan, or being illegitimate, deserted
by its mother, or being legitimate, deserted by both parents, or deserted by one
parent, the other parent being dead or under sentence of penal servitude, or
suffering permanently from mental disease, or out of England."

1990. Is there any rule as to the class of the foster-parents?
No; there is no rule, but the people who generally take the children are either
labouring people, small shopkeepers, or small farmers, or working people.

1991. Are they allowed to be boarded out with any relations?
No.

1992. What is the reason for that prohibition?
Because if they are boarded out with relations, it tends to make the relations
shirk the responsibility, when they sometimes could afford to support the chil-
dren. There is no distinct regulation or article laid down upon that point, but
there is a very strong recommendation in the circular letter.

1993. What is the scale of payments allowed to foster-parents?
The limit per head is 4s. a week for maintenance, 10s. a quarter for clothing,
10. a year for medical attendance, and school fees besides.

1994. At what age are children boarded out?
They may not be boarded out under two years of age, or over 10 for the first
time; but they may be boarded out when they are over 10 years of age if they
have been boarded out before.

1995. At what age does the boarding-out cease?
They go to service usually, on an average, at the age of 14. Some guardians
lay down a rule that the payment must cease at the age of 13. Others go on,
but very few, until they are 16, or nearly so.

1996. If a child who is boarded out obtains service at the age of 13, and for
some reason loses its place, say within three or four months, what is done then?
The foster-parents nearly always receive them back as if they were their own
children.

1997. Is the boarding out renewed?
No, the boarding out is not renewed; the foster-parents practically always
adopt them and have them back without payment. I have known one or two
cases where the boarding out has been renewed, but it is very seldom done. The
foster-parents usually make a permanent home for them, and shelter them
between situations as they would their own children. It is only under one
committee that I have found circumstances to the contrary.

1998. How
1998. How would you deal with a case where the foster-parents had died, or were no longer able to take the children?

The committee usually takes care of them in some way.

1999. Are we to understand that a second boarding out would be prohibited, or merely that it is not practised?

It would not be prohibited under the age of 16, but it is not the practice.

2000. In a special case there might be a re-boarding out?

Yes, in a special case I have known it done.

2001. Probably the recommendation of the committee would have considerable weight?

Not always, because the guardians do not always grant what the committee has asked for. The payments come from the guardians to the committees, and the committees do not always get all that they ask for from the guardians. Sometimes they do and sometimes they do not.

2002. Do you find any tendency at all to take children in such a way as might be described by the term "baby farming"?

Yes, if the foster-parents could get them they certainly would.

2003. Have you been able to prevent it?

The regulations prevent children chargeable to the union from being boarded out more than a certain number in one house; but nothing but the good sense of the committee, or an order from the guardians, can prevent the foster-parents from receiving children who are boarded out from voluntary sources in the same house. For instance, I found two children some time ago who were put in a house where there were at least four others, other children boarded out by voluntary payments. I could only report it; it was not against any rules, though it was bad; but whether such a thing is done or not must depend upon the good sense of the committee.

2004. Those other children, I suppose, were boarded out by charitable persons?

Some of them were, but it was quite difficult to say in this case who boarded them out, because the woman would not tell me how many more she had got. I saw six. She was living on them, practically, as a baby farmer.

2005. Were any steps taken in that case to put an end to boarding out with that woman?

I believe that the children have been left there because they had been there a long time; but I cannot be sure what has happened ultimately.

2006. Do you not think that it is desirable that in a case of that kind they should be removed elsewhere?

Certainly, usually; but I would rather not say that it would be desirable in this particular case. There were extenuating circumstances.

2007. What course do you take to carry your inspection into effect?

I see about their health, and, as far as I can judge, whether they are properly taken care of, and whether they have proper medical attendance if they are ill; I see, as far as I can, about their food, but I am not able to do much in that way, for of course I go only once, and I cannot see what it is constantly; I see what stock of clothing they have, as well as what they have on, so as to see that the foster-parents are doing their duty by spending the clothing allowance properly; I see that they are clean, and I look to their sleeping arrangements, and the state of the cottages; and I try to ascertain how the children are being influenced by the foster-parents; and if anything against the character of the foster-parents is forced upon me, I make inquiries, but otherwise I take it for granted that they are respectable. I also inquire into their school attendances, being supplied by the Local Government Board with forms for that purpose.

2008. With so large a number of children scattered about the country, are you able to see them all within any reasonable time?

I have hitherto been able to do all that is wanted.

(70.)
2009. How often do you see those children?
I have no regular time to do it; I do not think it would be a very good thing if I saw them too often, because it would diminish the responsibility of the committees who must watch over them.

2010. In the course of the year how many children are you able to visit?
That depends very much on the district over which they are scattered. In one three months I managed to see 232. The year before last I think I saw through the whole year 365.

2011. I suppose the knowledge that you may come has a very considerable effect?
Yes, they are always surprise visits. I have found that some of the committee did not even know of my existence, so that they could not be prepared. I think everything depends upon whether the visit is a surprise, because if the foster-parents know you are coming they prepare for you.

2012. As the result of your inspection, have you found many cases where children were not in a satisfactory condition?
I have found some such cases, but that entirely depends upon the supervision and care of the particular committee. Under many committees I have not found a fault; again, with one or two others I have found some very bad cases.

2013. What kind of cases?
"A., B., and C., were boys of about 7, 8, and 10, who had been about two years with a town crier. The wife kept a grocer's shop, and they had one grown-up son at home; the boys were stunted, dull in manner, and extremely dirty and ragged. A.'s head was alive (none of their heads being satisfactory in this respect), and C.'s quite black under his hair. Their clothes were worn out, and the feet of their stockings nearly gone, while their foster-mother could show me none better, and scarcely any clothing besides. The whole house was dirty and untidy, the boys' beds being especially dirty. A lodger, a man of whom I heard a character the reverse of satisfactory, slept in a room, to reach which he had to pass through theirs, and since the boys had been here a woman had lodged here, who, I was told, was not a more desirable inmate. The account given me of the foster-mother herself was not a good one. The lady appointed as special visitor to this home said that she had demonstrated in vain about it, and desired me to say that unless the boys were removed to another home, she would no longer visit them." (See 16th Annual Report of the Local Government Board, Appendix 13, page 123).

2014. Have you known any cases where the children were cruelly treated?
I have not seen any cruelty myself, and I have only myself come upon one case of running away. I have heard of their having been beaten, and what one may call roughly treated, but not tortured, or in any danger.

2015. Without pursuing the matter into a variety of cases, are those cases comparatively rare?
Yes, quite.

2016. Do you think that, generally speaking, the number of cases is so small that the result upon the whole may be pronounced as satisfactory?
Yes, I think that the comparative majority of good cases is so great that the result may be called highly satisfactory.

2017. Do these children as a rule easily obtain employment when they get old enough?
That depends very much upon the character of the district. In some places it is very difficult to find employment for boys; in others it does not seem so difficult. The girls can usually find places as domestic servants, and the ladies take a great deal of pains in finding situations for them. But it is very difficult work, because many of them are naturally dull and delicate, and they sometimes return from their places for those reasons. As a rule, the ladies take infinite pains in seeing after them between their places.

2018. They
2018. They are mostly or entirely boarded out in agricultural districts, I think?
Mostly; I found two boarded out in the town of Bristol; and those have been removed; but others are boarded out in the towns of Birmingham, and Dudley, and such places.

2019. But the Local Government Board rather discourage, I think, boarding out anywhere but in agricultural districts?
Very much; it is entirely contrary to the intention of boarding out to send children from London or from Manchester to Birmingham.

2020. Have you ever heard any complaint that those children, taken from towns and placed in agricultural districts, interfere with the chance of employment of the children naturally belonging to those districts?—I have only heard that once, and that was in Suffolk; I have not heard it elsewhere. The jealousy that I find usually is a jealousy amongst the neighbours for the possession of these children because it brings in a considerable sum.

2021. Have any of those children become chargeable to the union afterwards?
It is not my business to follow them up when in service, and it is only accidentally that I hear of them then; but as a rule I think they certainly do not become chargeable to the union. It is only under one Committee that I have ever come across any who have ever become chargeable, under the same Committee who were responsible for the bad case which I have read from my report.

2022. Would it not appear that there was some injustice to a union in having to take charge of children sent from other unions?
Very great, I think.

2023. In such cases might it not be advisable that there should be a right of recovering from the union which originally sent the children down?
I think so; that is my individual opinion.

2024. Do the girls or the boys more easily get employment?
The girls, because it is very difficult for a boy at the age of 14 to be able to maintain himself entirely; he gets very low wages, and if he does not live on with his foster-parents it is difficult to know what to do with him; but as a rule they do go on living with their foster-parents.

2025. What do you think is the motive generally of the foster-parents in taking them, the desire to get the money which is paid with them, or a wish to have children in their homes?
I think that a great many are without children, and have very much wished for children; and I have constantly found cases of people who have adopted other people’s children, not boarded-out children, simply from love of children, without any payment. The majority take them for the sake of the payment, but they very frequently become attached to them in the end, and come to look upon them as their own.

2026. Have you observed much attachment between the foster-parents and the children?
A very great deal.

2027. That you would, I am sure, regard as one of the best features of the system?
That, and the fact of their receiving them back after they have gone to service; so that the children are provided with friends and a home, such as the children from an institution can never have, however good the institution may be.

2028. Looking at the whole system, have you come to the conclusion that it is the best plan of dealing with pauper children who are deserted, or who are orphans?
Yes.

(70.)
2029. You prefer that system to the system of cottage homes?
Yes, I think so; especially for that reason, that they have a home and friends to return to when they are out of situations. They make friends for life, and they make friends in the world, and become independent, and become merged in the general population.

2030. Do you think that the system might be extended and carried further with advantage.
Yes, I think that some children from every union might be boarded out.

2031. Are there any other points to which you would like to refer?
I think that the work of the Committee is good, and that the children are well looked after, almost in proportion to the smallness of the area within which the committee work; where a committee is limited to one parish or to two or three neighbouring parishes, so that the whole of the committee know each other, and know all the children, and the committee can meet as a committee and discuss them, the children are thoroughly well looked after. But where the committee is scattered very widely, the children practically are not under the committee at all, but under individuals who may be careless or unobservant, and who, under any circumstances, have not the authority to treat these children as they think fit, or to remove them. The authority and practical power rest then with the secretary of the committee, who resides at a distance, and the local visitor does not feel her own responsibility for looking after the children. The Board are so much of this opinion that they are now limiting every committee when it is first formed to a certain parish or parishes, and they have requested that the larger committees may be broken up and divided into small local committees.

2032. Is there any organised means of ascertaining what becomes of these children when they cease to be paid for out of the rates?
No; I wish there was. The committees themselves look after them, as a rule, very well, when they have gone out; but there is no organisation for the purpose, and I wish very much that the Girls' Friendly Society could arrange a definite plan for following them up systematically, because the society is universal, and would see after them wherever they may be. When I worked in the Girls' Friendly Society I tried very hard to get it done, but I was not able to succeed.

2033. That would be only up to a certain age, would it?
Till they marry.

2034. Do you think it is desirable to keep anyone for so long a time in dependence upon the assistance and support of a charitable society?
It is not the purpose of the society to give assistance or support; they simply keep a register of where the girls are, and if any assistance is wanted, they give it, and they do not give it if it is not wanted.

2035. Still, it keeps up a connection between the girl and the charitable association; would it not tend rather to break down the spirit of independence to keep them in that manner in association with a charitable body?
No, I do not think so, because you can hardly call it a charitable body. Its object is only to promote good character, and the members (that is, the girls) help as much as the associates do. The girls have to pay a small subscription in order to belong to it.

2036. Do you apply it to boys?
I have tried to do it for the boys through the Young Men's Friendly Society, but I have not been able to do it, as yet.

2037. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have you any experience with regard to children boarded out within their own unions?
Yes, but this has been my unofficial work. Before my appointment I used to do what I could towards looking after the poor children who were boarded out in my own county (in Nottinghamshire). I got ladies to look after them as well as I could in every union, under the guardians.

2038. Were you favourably impressed with the result of that system?
I think it is better than the workhouse, but I do not think it is nearly so good.
good as having them under committees of ladies who are thoroughly responsible for them. It is very advantageous to them that women should look after them; especially in matters of cleanliness and clothing; and within the union they are visited only as a rule by the relieving officer and the medical officer, the parish doctor.

2039. In your experience, either official or otherwise, have you had much occasion to see the interior arrangements of workhouses?

Yes; a good deal.

2040. Have you any reason to think that children, so far as they are inmates of workhouses, still suffer disadvantage and harm?

It is a disadvantage to them to be brought up in a workhouse, but I think that they are very kindly treated. All those that I have come across have been extremely kindly treated, and everything has been done for them that could be done under the circumstances.

2041. Do you think that there is a feeling on the part of the working classes generally that a stigma and reproach attach to the fact of being a workhouse child?

I think it is greatly exaggerated; I do not think that there is so much of that as is popularly supposed.

2042. But it is considered a great matter, is it not, to prevent children being associated more than is necessary with those who are called workhouse children?

I have never found this. On the contrary, whenever we have invited the workhouse children to a school treat with the rest, they have been made much of both by the other children and their elders.

2043. Have you a favourable opinion of the system of district schools?

I do not think it is so good as boarding out.

2044. You think, perhaps, that the massing of children in one building or in one institution is not satisfactory?

I do not think it is the best system. I do not think that they gain the independence which they gain when they are brought up in a family, and they cannot be already provided with friends when they go out into the world in the same way.

2045. I think with the experience which you give with regard to children who are boarded out within their own unions applied to the country, but not to towns?

There are very few large towns where they are boarded out within the union; Leeds boards out within the union, and there they have special relieving officers who look after the children. They say that it works well, but I know nothing of it personally. I do not think that boarding out in towns can be satisfactory: you cannot know so much about the people, and besides, the people in towns so often take the children as servants to run errands or to work in different ways.

2046. You think that there is more liability to that danger in towns?

Yes, much more.

2047. To such an extent that you would not advocate the adoption of the system in towns?

Certainly not.

2048. Have you come across instances of cruelty to children, not necessarily children who are boarded out, or in any way connected with the workhouse, but children whose parents or guardian: are supposed to be taking charge of them?

Yes; I could not, at all events in a moment, recall any case in particular, but I have come across such cases.

2049. I put the question rather with a view of asking whether you think that in such cases the officials of the Poor Law could be made in any way, (70.)

G o responsible
responsible, owing to the fact that they generally have information of cases where children are being starved or otherwise ill-treated? I do not see how the relieving officer could know about it, unless the people happened to be on out-relief. If not, he would merely hear it by accident.

2050. Earl of Strafford.] I think you said that the sum paid was 4s. a week for maintenance, 10s. a quarter for clothing, and 10s. a year for medical attendance?

Yes.

2051. Do you think that sum is sufficient to keep a child in a proper condition with regard to clothing and health, and other requirements?

Yes, quite enough. Practically it is not always given. The London guardians give that sum, but the provincial unions do not as a rule give so much.

2052. What do they give?

They give sometimes 3s. per week for maintenance, and sometimes 3s. 6d. The board that pays lowest for children under certified committees is the Carlisle Board; they give 4s. a week there all round for everything. That is to pay for food, clothing, doctors, school fees, and everything.

2053. That is hardly sufficient, is it, or is the cost of living less in the north than it is in the south?

At Carlisle they board out their children under only one committee, and they have boarded out very few. Those are under a committee near Penrith, and I find that the children are very well cared for for that sum; and I think it must be evident that if in a neighbourhood where the labourers are only earning 10s. a week, they have two children boarded with them for whom they receive 8s. a week, only for their food, it must be a great help to the family, considering that those children are, besides, clothed and sent to school, and have their doctor's bill paid if they are ill.

2054. In what parts of England is the larger sum given for the medical attendance and for clothing; in the south, or in the western districts of England.

It depends rather upon the district from which it is paid. The London guardians, as a rule, pay the full 4s. to whatever committee they send the children, whether north or south.

2055. Then they are more liberal in their payments than the country guardians?

Yes, than most country guardians; not quite all.

2056. Do you see great variety in the different children as to their growth and health and physical formation; should you say that they are better nurtured and stronger in the north than in the south or west?

It is difficult to judge of that, because it depends upon the state of health they were sent out in, and many of them are sent out in a delicate state. I constantly find them marked, especially on their necks ringed with the scars of sores and abscesses.

2057. You would not like to give an opinion as to what part of England or Wales the children are stronger in than others?

Scarcely. There is a committee at Sidmouth, where the children seem to thrive wonderfully. Then again, there is Windermere, where they seem to do admirably. They seem to do equally well where the committee take care of them properly.

2058. Are the children from the manufacturing districts of Lancashire, such as Oldham, Blackburn, Burnley, well-grown and nurtured?

Oldham, Blackburn, and Burnley, do not board out. The only unions which board out in those districts are Liverpool, West Derby, and Chorlton; and I think those children are quite as healthy, and perhaps rather healthier, on the average, than those sent out from London; they are finer children on the whole.

2059. Earl of Hopetoun.] Are the children who are boarded out in these houses looked down upon by the other children in the villages?

No
Miss Mason.

No, I do not think they are at all, because they are a long way from their own unions. That is one good reason for sending them away from the union. The village-people know nothing about their unions; they scarcely know where the children come from.

2060. But I suppose that the other children who come to school with them know that they are from the workhouse?

Very often they do not know it. They call them "London children," or "London orphans," and they look upon them as the particular possession of the ladies' committee. Sometimes, indeed, they are thought rather superior on that account.

2061. Do the children ever take the names of their foster parents?

Yes, occasionally.

2062. And do they become quite members of the family?

Yes, they very often go by their names; but that depends very much upon the committee and upon the place; they vary.

2063. Lord Thring.] You say that these boarded-out children are usually dull and delicate; do you mean that as a general rule they are below the ordinary standard of children of the same class?

I do not mean that they become so from having been boarded out, but I think that they come out under disadvantages.

2064. I understand that the workhouse children of whom you have cognizance are as a general rule in your opinion below the ordinary class of children of the same rank in health and physique?

Yes.

2065. And in intellect?

Not altogether in intellect; some of them are deficient in intellect; but a great many of those who come from London are very much sharper and quicker than the children amongst whom they are placed in the country.

2066. Although they are stunted in growth?

Yes; and I find them constantly carrying off the prizes at the schools. I more often than not find the house full of prizes which the boarded-out children have gained.

2067. Who pays for the schooling of these boarded-out children?

The union to which they are chargeable.

2068. That is paid in addition to the maintenance money?

Yes.

2069. The schooling is always paid?

Yes.

2070. Has it come under your notice at all whether the effect of education upon these stunted children is deleterious?

I never heard any complaint of their being forced at school.

2071. And you do not know that they are injured at all, as we have been told, by over-forcing at the schools?

I have never had any complaint made to me about it.

2072. You do not know it of your own knowledge?

I do not.

2073. Do you know how they are fed at the schools?

If it is dinner-time, I look at their dinner at school, if they take their dinner with them.

2074. Is that sufficient?

Yes, as a rule, and very often they cannot take meat with them to school their foster-mother gives them broth, or something of that kind for tea.

2075. Do they give them breakfast also?

Yes, always; I should hope so at least; I am not there at breakfast-time.

(70.)
2076. Do the foster-mothers generally supply those children with meat or with broth, the produce of meat, for their dinner?
Yes, I usually find some meat on the table in each house I go into.

2077. But I mean when they are at school. Do they come home to dinner in the middle of the day?
If they are near they come home to dinner, but if they are a mile or a mile and a-half off their dinner is sent with them.

2078. But do you find meat sent with them?
Now and then, but not very often.

2079. But sufficient food is sent with them?
Yes.

2080. Are you aware what the other children in those schools have?
I think they are very much alike in the country; whatever they are stinted in I do not think that they are often stinted in food.

2081. Throughout the country?
Throughout the country. They are very much better fed than you would possibly think.

2082. Do you base that observation upon a considerable knowledge of a great number of schools in different parts of England?
Yes, I think so; it is from a very large number, for I generally see at least one school every day.

2083. Earl of Milltown.] With regard to that case which you mentioned, which was somewhat of a baby-farm, where you saw at least six children, and it may have been more, were the children neglected?
No, they were not.

2084. That was the reason, I presume, why they were left there?
That was the reason.

2085. About how many children, altogether, do you visit?
I should think there might be now between 1,200 and 1,300.

2086. Does each child receive a visit a year?
No; I go when I can.

2087. A year may very well pass without any visit?
Yes; and I do not think it is necessary that I should go every year, because my inspection is very thorough, and I write a detailed report on every individual child, which I send in to the Local Government Board, and they send a copy to the guardians, so that if there is anything amiss it ought to be altered at once; and it ought not to be necessary for me to come down again within a short time.

2088. Have you ever noticed any jealousy amongst the working classes at these considerable sums being paid for the maintenance of these workhouse children?
I have heard of that in Norfolk, but that is the only county in which I have heard of it, except in the case of one committee in Westmoreland, when I heard it merely touched upon; but that is because the ladies there give a great deal in addition to the union payments, so that the children are far better off there than the ordinary labourers' children.

2089. You would think that to a working man who is only earning 10 s. a week for himself and his wife and his children, 4 s. seems rather a large sum to pay for one workhouse child?
Yes; but the jealousy, I think, is the jealousy of the foster-parents who receive the money, and not jealousy of the children.

2090. Chairman.] You mentioned that there had been some jealousy in Norfolk; in that case were the foster-parents receiving from some Metropolitan union as much as 4 s. a week, besides payment for clothing and other matters?
Yes.

2091. Are you sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances of the labourer in
in that part of England to be able to answer whether that would not be far in excess of anything that a labouring man could command for his own children? It certainly would.

2002. Where a man is earning only 10s. a week it would be impossible, would it not, that if he had several children he could afford to spend that amount on any one child?

Quite impossible.

2003. Even allowing for a reasonable sum as remuneration for taking charge of the child, do you not think that in cases of that kind, where wages are low, such sums are in excess of what it is desirable to pay?

It is very difficult to lay down a rule, because the rate of wages varies from year to year; and then also some boards of guardians place children out with different committees, and they might not like the trouble of making a different scale of payment for each different committee; but I think you are right in saying that it is more than the labourers have for their own children, and that that does not seem desirable. At the same time it should be observed that a child eats more in a district school than boarded out.

2004. Have you ever known it happen that comparisons are drawn between the amount allowed in a union for children boarded out, within the union, or belonging to it, and the amount allowed from some union in London?

No, I never heard of any discontent about that.

2005. Would it not be rather an awkward circumstance if it was found that 4s. a week, including everything, was sufficient to board out a child belonging to the union satisfactorily within the union, and that a much larger sum was given for a child sent from London?

It might be; but I think that the remedy might be that the London guardians might give less in that case, and might give the same amount as was paid for the children from within the union.

2006. Would it not be desirable that some inquiry should be made with regard to that, so that not more than what might be considered to be the average cost of the maintenance of the children might be paid in a particular district?

I do not see how you could enforce it. It is always within the power of the guardians to make such an inquiry; and the committee might consent to receive less.

2007. Otherwise it might be that the London union would raise the price, as against the guardians of the union to which the children were sent; would not that be a great hardship?

I do not think that they are likely to do so.

2008. Earl of Aberdeen.] Does your report to the Local Government Board state the number of children whom you found it necessary to remove from their places of abode?

No, I do not always even make a recommendation that they should be removed. I state the facts, and I leave the guardians and the Local Government Board to judge of them. Sometimes, if the case appears very evident to me, I do make a recommendation, but not always even then, because I think the facts speak for themselves better than my recommendation can.

2009. In your last report, you mention a case where one child was in a house where there were a great many lodgers taken in rather promiscuously; in such a case would the children be removed?

The paragraph in my report, of which you are speaking, refers to several cases, and I could not answer that question without going into the details of each. The facts were received and accepted by the Local Government Board, and the reports forwarded by them to the guardians. There is no absolute prohibition against lodgers; but only a strong disapproval of them expressed in the Local Government Board’s Circular Letter. Each case varies, and is dealt with on its own merits.

2100. I suppose one of the difficulties of the system lies in this: that the (70.)

visitors
visitors or local agents are somewhat fearful of giving an unfavourable report to the committee, or to the guardians, for fear that they should be subject to annoyance?

I have only found one such case. As a rule the committees are most anxious to find out the real facts, and to own them perfectly candidly in the interests of the children. In one exceptional case, or cases, the secretaries of the committee denied or disputed facts which were fully admitted by the local members of their widely scattered committee.

2101. Earl Spencer.] Are the committees always composed of ladies?

Nearly always: there are some gentlemen upon them, but most of the committees are formed of ladies.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Reverend William P. Jay, is called; and Examined, as follows:

2102. Chairman.] You are the Vicar of Christ Church, St. George's-in-the-East?

Yes.

2103. Have you ever been a guardian in St. George's-in-the-East?

No, I have never been a guardian; I am a member of the Tower Hamlets for the London School Board; I can only speak about the work from what I know as a clergyman.

2104. Have you been a guardian elsewhere?

No.

2105. You were for some time in Hackney, were you not?

I was for three years in Hackney.

2106. Was that recently?

That was five years ago.

2107. The system in Hackney was, I apprehend, very different from that in St. George's-in-the-East?

Yes.

2108. We are aware from the evidence given by previous witnesses of the system which has been pursued in St. George's-in-the-East, and we should be glad if you would tell us what are the points upon which it differed in Hackney?

In Hackney the out-door relief or any other relief was given in a promiscuous way; it was more of a scramble than it is in St. George's-in-the-East. Hackney was a richer union, and therefore there was not that pressure that there is in St. George's-in-the East to keep the rates down, and the out-door relief was given freely.

2109. Was there any labour yard?

I believe so. I am not sure.

2110. Do you think that in Hackney the out-door relief was given to persons who did not really require it?

I daresay there were instances of that kind. My own feeling with regard to the matter was that out-door relief in real cases was always inadequate.

2111. Then was it practically relief in addition to wages, or do you think that it was relief which was supplemented by charity?

It was a relief which was, unfortunately, inadequate relief, which kept the people in great misery without doing any permanent good. As an instance, which I myself practically had to do with, I may mention that an old man who had been a gentleman's servant, a very intelligent old man, had half-a-crown and two loaves a week; and his daughter used to take 2s. for the room and allow him sixpence for jam. He used to feed upon this jam and the two loaves. When I knew him he was in a most terrible state of dirt and filth. He used to live in a little room, a small cupboard, and although he had been in service and had
had travelled about, and was an intelligent man, what with insects and one thing and another, he was in such a wretched condition that I spoke to the relieving officer and said, that if he would arrange to take off the out-door relief and so force the man into the house, I would take care that nothing happened in the fortnight or three weeks while the guardians were looking into the case, and that I would visit him and allow him out of my own pocket some money to keep him going for the time. The case was brought before the guardians, and the relief was cut off. He was some ten days or a fortnight before his daughter consented to his going into the house. He went into the infirmary first, and I visited him there, and I should think that in a fortnight or three weeks you would hardly have known the man again. He afterwards told me that he was delighted to come in there, because his condition had formerly been so miserable, and when he was removed into the infirmary it was very different.

2112. Apart from individual cases, do you think that the system of out-door relief administered in Hackney tended to demoralise the working classes in the parish?

I think that it tended to demoralise them in the way of making them very discontented; there was always a discontented feeling that it was unfair; that if you had interest with the guardians you could get it, and if you had not you could not get it; and also, being inadequate, the cases were very hard.

2113. In cases where those persons had not what you term interest with the guardians, did they offer them the workhouse?

Yes; I should think that would usually be the case if they could not get any interest with the guardians.

2114. Do you know whether the workhouse was largely accepted by the poor of the Hackney Union?

That union is a large union, but in my part of the union I should think the workhouse was not accepted if they were not able to get relief.

2115. I see that in the Hackney Union, by the last Return furnished by the Local Government Board, taking the mean of the number in the workhouse on the 1st of July and 1st of January, the ratio per 1,000 in Hackney was 10\textsuperscript{4}, the ratio for the whole metropolis being 13\textsuperscript{5}; therefore the number of in-door paupers was not large. On the other hand, the ratio per 1,000 of out-door relief paupers was 17\textsuperscript{8}, and the ratio per 1,000 of the whole metropolis was 28\textsuperscript{2}. Comparing that state of things with St. George's-in-the-East, where there is a very small number of out-door relief paupers, and the in-door relief has been given as a rule, do you think that the effect upon the population has been better in St. George's-in-the-East than in Hackney?

It is difficult to compare the two, because Hackney is a much richer union—but it seems to me that in St. George's Union, where the majority of the people who pay the rates are what in other parts might be almost the pauper class, the general result, from what I have seen and heard there, is a distinct improvement. There has never been out-door relief in my time.

2116. But you say that you could not compare one union with the other, because the one is rich and the other is poor; that would have reference principally to the effect upon the ratepayers; but would not the effect of indiscriminate out-door relief upon the population in the rich union be just as injurious as in the poor union; that is to say, the effect upon the recipient?

Yes, it would be, of course.

2117. Do you think that the effect in Hackney was bad on the population generally?

Yes, I consider that the effect was bad, as I ventured to say before, in producing discontent.

2118. But you limit your answer to the discontent caused by the unequal administration of out-door relief; do you think that the large distribution of out-door relief, as compared with the system pursued in St. George's-in-the-East, has a bad effect on the population generally?

Yes; I consider that the effect was bad, as I ventured to say before, in producing discontent.
I can only judge of individual cases, and in individual cases I should say that it had a bad effect. Taking the whole population it is rather difficult to judge.

2119. Do you think that such a system that is pursued in St. George's-in-the-East should be applied in Hackney?
Yes, I should personally, for the good of the people, think that it would be very advantageous.

2120. What effect had the system in Hackney upon private charity; did it appear to diminish it?
No, I do not think it diminished the private charity, because in those cases where people are demoralised by a lot of giving, I think the more you give the more they want.

2121. Earl of Milltown.] But it might have had the effect of diminishing private charity in this way: that a person might say, "This man can get outdoor relief if he chooses to apply for it; why should I give him anything?"
Yes, there is charity given as well as relief, I am afraid both by religious bodies and by philanthropic bodies. There was no knowing who was getting relief and who was not.

2122. Is there in Hackney any considerable body of men who get only what may be termed intermittent work, and are out of work generally in the winter?
Yes, there are a large and increasing number, I think, in Hackney.

2123. And those men, I suppose, applied for out-door relief in the winter?
Yes.

2124. And they got it?
They got it sometimes; I would not say that they always got it; it would depend a great deal, as I said, so far as the individual cases were concerned, upon the interest they could make with the guardians.

2125. If they introduced the St. George's-in-the-East system into Hackney, would you be in favour of introducing it gradually?
Gradually.

2126. Dealing with new cases:
Yes.

2127. Do you think that there were many case of imposition in Hackney, where from want of inquiry into the cases men and women got relief who did not need it?
I should say only partially so. In most of those cases where they got relief, I should say that they were in need of a certain amount of relief. I should think that it was given without looking into the cases, except in a rough-and-ready way, in a large union where there are a large number of applicants.

2128. Do you think that was the fault of the relieving officer or the fault of the guardians?
I should not say that it was the fault of either, because it seems to me that with such a system as that you cannot well make anything but a rule of thumb without increasing the number of relieving officers.

2129. I understand you to say that there were not a sufficient number of relieving officers to carry out the duties properly:
No; but you must remember, of course, that the officers could only report to the board, and then the board, like all boards, had no fixed rule to guide them with regard to the relief; but it depended a good deal upon the interest of the people who applied.

2130. You think that they had no particular rule as to relief?
They had no special rules that would definitely guide them, I think, in the cases that I saw; but I have never been on the board myself.

2131. Have you found amongst the poorer classes in St. George's-in-the-East any dissatisfaction with the strict administration of the law?
I have
I have found no general dissatisfaction. Of course I have found dissatisfaction amongst the Socialists, for instance, who are a large and increasing number.

2132. They would argue in favour of much larger relief being given from the rates?

Their line would be that they would argue in favour of public relief works.

2133. In St. George's-in-the-East is there much charity distributed by religious bodies?

No; I should think that all the religious bodies are very poor. The Roman Catholics give very little, and the Church of England have very little to give, the Wesleyans lately having been giving a greater amount; but as a rule it is a very small amount that is given.

2134. Then the funds for the charity which is given are principally supplied from without?

Yes, principally from without.

2135. Supposing that there were not charitable persons outside who were willing to assist in St. George's-in-the-East, could the system that is there established be continued?

Yes, I consider that it could, because the cases for out-door relief could always be met. Take the case of a widow. The guardians offer to take two of the children, and enable her to keep the other children and herself as best she can. I am quite sure that she could always get a certain amount of help from her neighbours, and so on, while those two children were taken.

2136. Lord Thring. With regard to the children who attend the Board Schools in your parish, do you find that they are properly fed?

Unfortunately, many of them do not get properly fed.

2137. Do you think that, owing to their deficient feeding, education has a prejudicial effect upon their physical state?

I myself arrange for the feeding of 450 children every day in connection with special schools in my own neighbourhood. I do not think that any child who goes regularly to these schools need complain of want of food.

2138. But if you did not feed them in that way, the education which they receive would be injurious to their health, in your opinion?

That is a difficult question to answer. There was a case that we came across of two children who fainted in a school in Ratcliff Highway for want of food. The teacher went and spoke about it, and the home was visited, and it was found that the father was a ship's carpenter, getting 2 l. a week. He was a drunkard; he had been a dipsomaniac, and was hardly accountable for his actions.

2139. What do you charge for the meal?

We charge a halfpenny; but a large number of those dinners are free to the children who go regularly.

2140. Do you make any inquiry as to the status or position of the children to whom you give the meals?

I have nothing much to do with it myself, but we give it with great discrimination. They must be children who come regularly, and whom the teacher knows is lacking food, and also whom the School Board Visitor reports as needing food.

2141. Any system of free or partially free feeding of children ought to be accompanied by strict inquiry, ought it not?

It is a choice of evils. In the case of children, I should not see any great objection to feeding them; it does some harm, but it also does some good.

2142. It renders parents improvident, I presume?

Supposing that a large number of them are the children of dock labourers earning 16 s. or 18 s. a week, and those children are fed, the next man would (70.) say,
say, "Why should these men's children be fed for nothing, and I have to pay for mine?"

2143. Is it not a serious evil as respects the character of the poor, whose children attend these free meals, that a good labourer sees his children worse fed than a bad labourer, because he feels them himself? Yes; I think that is a great difficulty. It is a premium on improvidence.

2144. Can you suggest any remedy?
Only very careful inquiry.

2145. But inquiry makes it rather worse, because taking the children you instanced, who fainted, the father was able to support his children, and you gave them a free meal because they would have expired without it? I think it is a choice of evils, and you must judge for yourself which to choose.

2146. Might you not have summoned that man and punished him?
I do not think that you would get convictions. I am afraid that I could summon, taking all our Board Schools, a good number.

2147. Chairman.] Do you think that it might be well to strengthen the law, if it is not sufficient, so as to enable the authorities to punish parents who, being able to give their children sufficient nourishment, send them to school without sufficient nourishment?
I think that it would be a very good thing to be able to do so, but I doubt whether you would ever be able to carry a law like that into effect.

2148. Lord Thring.] A child is sent to school, and the doctor is called in, and finds that the child has not sufficient food given to it; why should you not summon the parents for non-maintenance?
Because I consider, without exaggeration (though it may seem an exaggerated statement to you), that you would often have to summon whole courts, and whole streets, too, for the matter of that. I am certain that most of these cases of great wretchedness and poverty are simply the results of improvidence and drink.

2149. Supposing that you did summon a whole street for once, do you not think that it might lead to greater improvidence?
But the magistrates will not convict when we summon the children for not going to school.

2150. I will assume that the magistrates would do their duty; do you or do you not think that it would be advantageous to strengthen the law in any way?
I do, if you could get convictions.

2151. You think that the law ought to be strengthened. Of course the question of convictions is a question apart?
Yes, quite so.

2152. Is there any other remedy that you can suggest with regard to the starvation of the children?
No, I have no remedy to suggest, except the remedy which I tried to carry out by giving free dinners to those who come regularly to school, and who upon inquiry we find need it.

2153. Do you think that the difference between giving free dinners and partially free dinners is material; for instance, is it material to charge a farthing for the breakfast and a halfpenny for the dinner, although neither the one sum nor the other repays the cost?
No, I do not think it matters a bit.

2154. You do not think the sentiment of paying a small sum is of any consequence?
No; I think that having to give the meals at all is an evil, and that the great point would be for the parents to feed the children at home; but very often the mother is working out all day, and is unable to prepare food for the children.

2155. The
2155. The best system would be to have a cheap remunerative dinner, if you could have it?

Yes; we began by trying cheap remunerative dinners, but they broke down in consequence of our having to give so many free ones.

2156. Supposing that you give remunerative dinners, and then allow charitable people to give tickets, is that, in your opinion, a good system?

No, I should have nothing to do with charitable people, because I think they give so promiscuously.

2157. Earl of Milltown.] The only instance in which you could proceed against a man for not giving his child enough to eat would be where the child died, and then the man would be tried for manslaughter?

Yes.

2158. Or if the child had the good fortune to be what is called one of the lower animals, you could proceed against the father for cruelty?

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children might interfere. We have many cases where the children are badly treated.

2159. Earl Spencer.] With regard to the payments for these dinners, you say that they really break down on account of the quantity of exceptions that you are obliged to make?

That is so in my case. I am speaking of a poor district; and I judge from the interest I have taken in the matter. In the 54 schools that we have in the Tower Hamlets I do not know of any paying system that is in force.

2160. Lord Thring.] Supposing that you said to the parents, "We will give your children free education, but we will make you pay a penny a day for their dinners," that would enable you to provide in a large town remunerative dinners, would it not?

I think that would break down in getting the payment for the dinners.

2161. Earl Spencer.] Do you have many scholars whose school fees are paid by the board of guardians?

None in St. George's; but the School Board for London remit fees very largely.

2162. In your parish are the school fees remitted to a very large extent?

My own opinion is that anybody who likes can get them remitted.

2163. Lord Thring.] I do not see why, if at the present moment a parent can be compelled to pay a penny for his child's schooling, you should not be able to substitute for it compulsion upon him to pay a penny for his child's dinner?

Unfortunately we cannot compel the parent to pay.

2164. I am putting a hypothetical case. Supposing that I make a law that education shall be free, and that every parent shall pay a penny for the dinner of his child, do you think that that would be a good plan?

I do not think you would be able to exact a penny; just as we, with all our machinery in the School Board, have utterly failed to get the school fees in the majority of cases, and have had to remit, so I think you would have to remit in these cases.

2165. Earl Spencer.] And the magistrates, when they were told that it was poverty that prevented the parents from paying, would not convict?

No; they will not convict, even in the case of children not going to school.

2166. Earl of Aberdeen.] A case has been brought to my knowledge of a very respectable workman, a Slater, with a wife and family, who being out of work owing to frost, was reduced to straits; when they had nothing left to eat, the wife went to the relieving officer and asked if she could have a few loaves to carry the family over the next week, after which the father expected work; the relieving officer said, no, they must come to the house, and that no outdoor relief could be given; how would you treat such a case as that?

I should say that you must look at the whole mass, and not at individual cases, and refer to private charity.

(70.)
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2167. Is
2167. Is not that a case where different people might think very differently? I should consider that such cases would be very exceptional, because the man would be in a hospital, and the guardians would take one or two of the children.

2168. The case which I put was not a case of ill-health, but of want of employment? If you dealt with out-of-work cases you would have to keep whole streets in my neighbourhood in the winter time.

2169. You think that charity ought to be brought into contact with those cases? I do, because charity can do it in a sympathetic way, and the Poor Law must do it as a matter of right.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Two o'clock.
Die Luna, 14o Maii, 1888.

LORDS PRESENT:

Earl of Jersey. | Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Earl Spencer. | Lord Bishop of Rochester.
Earl of Milltown. | Lord Balfour of Burley.
Earl of Onslow. | Lord Hopetoun (Earl of Hopetoun).
Earl of Strafford. | Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Kimberley. | Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley, k.g., in the Chair.

The Reverend Herbert Mills, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

2170. Earl of Aberdeen.] I think you are Minister of Market Place Chapel, at Kendal?
Yes.

2171. Have you for a long time paid attention to matters connected with the Poor Law administration?
Yes; about four years and a half.

2172. In what locality was your first experience as regards any details of administration?
In Liverpool.

2173. What was it that led you to investigate the circumstances of the poor in Liverpool?
I had long had an interest in the general question of the poor (it was that which led me into the ministry) and some interest in the science of political economy; and, getting to Liverpool, and being brought very directly in contact with the poor, one was naturally led to ask why they did not more frequently go into the workhouse. That was the beginning of my investigation into this branch of the subject.

2174. Though you have not been a guardian of the poor, you have been a very frequent visitor amongst them, I believe, and in that capacity have inquired into the effects of Poor Law relief?
Yes. I was connected with a provident society as a voluntary visitor, and with the Charity Organisation Society as a voluntary visitor of theirs, and had occasion, quite four days a week at the least, to make visits in certain districts in Liverpool where poor people lived.

2175. Generally speaking, what opinion have you formed as to the effect of out-door relief upon the poor?
That on the whole it is mischievous, and that in many instances it tends to reduce wages amongst the very poorest. I mean that there are cases where it would be regarded quite as a kind of make-wage where it enables those who get out-door relief to compete unfairly with others who are receiving low wages in the same trades.

2176. Are you speaking of towns or of the country?
Only of large towns now.

2177. Does that element tend to make it popular with the ratepayers?
I cannot answer that question. I do not think ratepayers generally pay much (70.) attention
attention to it; they do not discriminate between out-door relief and in-door relief, it seems to me.

2178. Have you anything to say with regard to indoor relief, so far as your experience goes?

Yes; that it seems to me to be a system by which a great amount of human labour is wasted. I have found cases in the Liverpool Workhouse of women who were able to make clothing, and had made clothing before going into the house, who, when they were sent into the house, did no useful work in any way; not contributing to the maintenance of the house. That seemed to me to be unnecessarily wasteful, and to be very demoralising to the poor themselves.

2179. Upon the question of labour, what opinion have you formed as to the stone-breaking yard system, or rather, I should say, the labour-yard system?

In relation to the men who go there, do you mean?

2180. Yes?

That, generally speaking, the men who are in the stone-breaking yard are the most hopeful of the class who come to the Poor Law guardians for relief. Speaking generally, they are a better class of people than either the inmates of the house or those to be found in the casual wards. There are instances where men walk great distances in order to get this work. I met with some men at Bristol about a fortnight since who, I was told, walked eight miles every day in order to do this work in the stone-yard (it was a hard day's work there) for a very low wage, varying from 1 s. 10 d. to 1 s. 6 d. a day. That seemed to me to indicate higher moral qualities in the poor themselves than you would find in any other departments of the workhouse.

2181. We have been told that in London the persons who resorted to the labour yards were not of the character that you rather indicate, but that they were a class of people who did not want to get regular work, but preferred this method of obtaining a pittance occasionally. Does that tally with your experience in other towns?

I should say that is not the case with other towns; but I have heard so much testimony of the same kind concerning the London workhouses that I have come to the conclusion, without visiting any of them, that those who come under the influence of the Poor Law here are a much more degraded class of people than those you find in the country, and that probably they are better cared for; I mean that they get more of the outward necessaries of life here, are more pampered than in the country workhouses.

2182. Would those men who walked eight miles in order to work at a labour yard be in the main agricultural labourers, or would they be mechanics or other work?

At Bristol I did not ask that question. In Liverpool, in the Toxteth Union, where I had occasion to go amongst the men of the same class who had been in the stone-breaking yard, a great proportion were agricultural labourers who had come down in the hope of getting work at the docks at Liverpool.

2183. Do you think it is more difficult for a skilled workman to find work now than it was 20 or 30 years back?

Yes; if once he gets out of work it is very much more difficult. There have been a good many things that have led to that.

2184. Such as——?

First of all, it is due to the fact that during the last 20 years there has been an extension to other countries of the districts in which the staple trades of England have been carried on; I mean that the English cotton and iron trades, for example, are gradually losing the markets of the world; that other countries are beginning to do the things for themselves which England used to do for them; this causes English workmen to have less work to do. It is a change in industrial life. Germany, Russia, and Italy are all beginning to do manufacturing work by means of the most modern machinery; this is a cause of depression which, I fear, will be permanent.

2185. In
2185. In relation to that, have you any remark to offer as to the conditions under which the poor live now as compared with the period when the present Poor Law system was established, 1834?

Yes, I think the whole question turns upon that: that when the Poor Law was fashioned in 1834, it probably met the needs of the times then; that the Commissioners then could look with a certain amount of reasonable expectation to the employers of labour being able to take up all unemployed labour which was worth taking up, and that then the Poor Law would only have to deal with the refuse of the labour market; whereas now the people who are thrown out of work are not the worst class by any means, but very frequently skilled labourers are thrown out of work. The employer of labour is getting his work done more and more by means of machinery and less and less with human labour. That change has taken place very rapidly indeed within the last 12 or 14 years. It is a second cause of depression peculiar to our times; and as this change in the method of production is permanent it will tend to increase the proportion of unemployed workpeople. The system of 1834 was devised to meet social conditions very much different from those which prevail now. We have now a large class of industrious deserving poor too honourable to accept the kind of relief we are offering them.

2186. Then, as regards that aspect of the matter, you would infer that the causes of the present difficulty of getting work are permanent unless some other alleviating source arises?

Yes; I should say that the policy of looking merely to employers of labour to give work to people who are out of work is hopeless; I mean that machinery, when once it has been introduced and has been proved to be an advantage over previous methods of production, will never be abandoned; we shall go on using the machine, and if possible get better machines, and so displace more and more labour.

2187. Have you formed any opinion as to any method by which the Poor Law could be altered, so as to relieve the poor without what one may call the degrading element?

Yes; it seems to me that, instead of giving doles, a system could be devised by which work could be given which would be free from all the objections which hitherto have been raised against the giving of work through the Poor Law. I mean that work could be given in such a way that it would not interfere with the labour market outside; that the poor could be helped with great advantage to the poor themselves, and with a great advantage to the ratepayers, by giving them work to do that produced the necessities of life for themselves; and that that work should be put in place of wasteful work like oakum-picking. Oakum-picking is exceedingly wasteful in many instances; in Liverpool, they lose over 50l. every year between the price of the ropes and the price at which they sell the oakum; and in some unions there is a loss of 6d. a ton (West Derby Union is one) on the stone-breaking yard. It seems to me that, instead of wasteful work of that kind, work could be given on the land; that in the neighbourhood of each of the large towns, where there is a great surplus of labour, there could be a plot of land taken, and work given of a productive kind; work that would give the labourers wheat and oats, and all the work that is involved in taking care of cows, and the production of milk, butter, cheese, beef, and leather.

2188. Would the scheme which you indicate, in your opinion, involve the reclamation of waste land?

It could be applied to the reclamation of waste land when there was no better land in the market standing idle; but at present there is a great amount of land in three or four counties in England which could be used without immediately resorting to waste land; land in Essex and Suffolk, some in Kent, and some in Gloucestershire, is offered at as low a price as 10l. an acre.

2189. Do you know of any places where a system of that kind has been attempted?

A partial system of the kind has been attempted here in England; I mean that there are differences between one workhouse and another in this regard: (70.)
that whilst in some workhouses all the work which is given to the inmates is absolutely wasteful, in the tramp ward particularly, and in the stone-breaking yard, there are unions as for instance the union at Newcastle on-Tyne, where useful work has been carried on. There, for some years past, they have made all their own boots and shoes, and all their own clothing, and cultivated sufficient land to grow all the cabbages and potatoes required in the house itself; indeed, they have overstepped the mark at Newcastle-on-Tyne, and for some years past have not only made boots and shoes for themselves, but have sold these things in the market without any complaints being made.

2190. Without reference to the selling of articles produced, are you aware whether this system of utilising the labour of the paupers has brought the guardians into conflict with any of the trade societies in Newcastle?

No; not with any trade society. The only conflict at Newcastle-on-Tyne has been in regard to their workhouse band. It went out and performed at public concerts; then the bandmaster of some other private band made a complaint, and the band was stopped; but there was no complaint made when over 300 l. worth of boots made in the workhouse were sold last year in the market.

2191. Was any building done by the paupers?

Yes. I have here a letter recently written by the workhouse master, if I may be allowed to read it. It is dated Newcastle Workhouse, 6th April 1888. It is addressed to the Chairman of the Board of Guardians, Mr. Adam Carese: "Dear Sir,—As requested, I beg to hand you the following information, viz.: Work done by inmates of the workhouse: new stone-sheds built, 100 feet by 62 feet; 3,177 feet of drainage laid down, together with grates, gullies, &c.; new spouting on the whole of hospitals and schools; pigg-ries and house built for labour superintendent and cartman; two infectious diseases hospitals built, 60 by 20 feet; painting and repairing the whole of the workhouse; cementing boys' and girls' play-grounds; flooring boys' and girls' and infants' schools and day-rooms; enlarging girls' class-room, and flooring same; painting, repairing, and decorating chapel; making reading-desks, chairs, &c.; re-modelling boys' school; lavatories and large bath, constructed for both boys and girls; book-case made for juvenile library. The whole of the boots and shoes have been made by the old men and boys, and a quantity sold. During the last five years value of boots made amounted to 2,585 l. 16 s. 11 d. Garden and land produce grown for the use of the workhouse, and a large quantity sold outside; value of the whole for five years is 2,244 l. 11 s. 4 d. The whole of the tinware used was made by the inmates. The ploughs, harrows, &c., for working the land have been made by the inmates. Carts and all their belongings have been repaired. About 100 feet of draining at vagrant ward, which was laid by contract, had to be taken up and re-laid by me. Dining-hall rebuilt and decorated. Sewing-room, in which the female inmates make the whole of the underclothing for men, and the whole of the women's and children's clothing, bedding, and house linen, built. The old buildings have been raised from nine to 13 feet high. Male imbécile wards have been altered and re-arranged; hospital boilers seated and boiler-shed built; new kitchen built; nursery and chronic wards arranged and fitted up; the whole of the men and boys' clothing made in tailor's shop; steam-heating arrangements renewed and repaired; new laundry built and fitted up.—Yours faithfully, James John Howell."

2192. Does he state what period is covered by the time during which those works were carried out?

No, but I could say, almost with certainty, that it is within five or six years.

2193. So far as you are aware, that has not created discontent among the independent workmen of Newcastle-on-Tyne?

No, in no case, except in the case of the workhouse band to which I have referred. I think they have sold nothing outside the workhouse except boots and shoes. A few years ago they sold surplus vegetables, but they have ceased to do it now because they have been compelled to use part of their land for building; they have now no vegetables to sell. They had about 15 acres of land which the guardians had been compelled to buy, in order to make some extensions, and
and the land had been lying on their hands; at first it was let to a farmer, but when they found that they could make their own boots and clothing they determined that they would try to grow some of their own food, and it was then they began to cultivate the land.

2194. Is the land any great distance from the workhouse?
No; some of the new buildings have been built on it.

2195. Have you any experience as to the working of similar systems elsewhere.
In Holland a system very similar is generally adopted. They give work to their unemployed people of a more useful kind than we do in England, without very much interfering with the labour market; they keep more of the poor with the same money and keep them in a healthier way.

2196. How did you obtain your information with regard to the Dutch system?
By visiting the place; I went there to visit the Dutch establishments and colonies about two years ago.

2197. Will you name the locality?
There are two institutions; one which is by far the most beneficial in its effects is not under Government control. It is called Frederiksoord; it is near Steenwyk, on the borders of Friesland, in North Holland. That is a colony that now keeps very nearly 2,000 people. Then there is a colony at Veenhuizen; that is a place which I visited, which is in the hands of the Government. Now both these colonies had the same origin. A soldier, named General Van den Bosch, in the year 1818 came out of the army, and devoted himself, as he said, to bringing the unemployed people and the waste land of Holland together again; and he founded a number of colonies, some seven or eight, and then he discovered that he must have two classes of colonies, for when he brought from the towns a new lot of recruits, the new men who were brought up seemed to contaminate the people who had been under his influence for some time, and to undo the moral work which he had done; and in that way he began to have a lower grade village, which got to be called a Beggars colony, where the men lived first when they came up from the towns. When he died the system had extended so much that several of the villages had merged into one, until now this place, called Frederiksoord, measures 16 miles, from one end to the other, covering land that has been reclaimed from the waste. Veenhuizen had always been a difficult problem, and after his death they had increased difficulty in keeping the men in order, and a greater loss always upon the working of that colony than upon the colony at Frederiksoord, and they were going to abandon it, when the Dutch Government took it over and managed that colony themselves, and called it the Beggars colony. When they took it over, they passed an Act by which men who were found begging in the street were sent to prison for a period varying from a fortnight to three months, and then sent for two years to this Beggars colony, and compelled to work there.

2198. Is there a system of classification in the colony?
The Beggars colony at Veenhuizen is divided into three parts. There is the women's colony, where the women are kept apart, and the men's colony is divided into two; there is an agricultural colony, where men are sent who are accustomed to gardening or farm work; and there is a manufacturing colony, where ironworkers, tinworkers, and weavers are kept together; they weave all their own clothing, they produce all their own food, and they manufacture a large number of coffee sacks for the Government by hand-loom.

2199. Do you wish the Committee to understand that you think that some system of that kind might be adopted in England?
I do; but much more the system that is carried out at Frederiksoord than the one that is carried out at Veenhuizen. At Frederiksoord there are fewer restraints, and the able-bodied poor are self-supporting; men come to it, and think it almost an honour to come; they are not compelled to stay, but they do stay of their own willingness. In the case of Veenhuizen, the men are sent there for two years by a magistrate, and they have to keep a large staff of soldiers (70.)
to chase them when they make their escape. In spite of that, large numbers of men come to Veenhuizen willingly; I spoke to the head gardener, who has been there now for nearly 30 years, and I found that he had been sent up 13 times; he goes out and comes back again so regularly that the Count Stirum, who has charge of that department, makes an agreement with him when he goes out that he shall come back again to his old post in five or six weeks.

2200. Owing to such abuses as you have indicated, you would think, I suppose, that any system of that sort, any system, I mean, of that particular description, may be regarded as impracticable in this country?

I think that more could be done by the men at less cost by working on the principle that is adopted at Frederiksoord. At Frederiksoord all the able-bodied are self-supporting. At Veenhuizen they do cost the community something.

2201. Leaving that topic, I want now to ask you about your experience of the casual wards. Have you had any opportunity of observing the system with regard to the casual ward in Liverpool?

Yes, I have visited the casual ward there, and seen the men in the room.

2202. Is there any attempt at classification there? I mean making a distinction between an ordinary tramp and a wayfarer seeking accommodation for the night?

I cannot answer that question. There seemed to be no possibility of making a distinction except by making one class of men grind Indian corn in one room and sending another class into another room to pick oakum. There were two rooms where men were at work.

2203. As regards the sleeping arrangements, was the room divided into cells?

No, they slept in a large room. I should say that it is better in Liverpool than it is in other unions; they have a bedstead to sleep upon there, and in some unions they have not.

2204. What is your impression of the arrangements in the casual ward generally?

My feeling is so strong about the casual ward that I am almost afraid to speak upon it. It seems to me to be the biggest blot we have upon our civilization that men should be treated as they are, in the casual wards merely for being poor. When I was admitted to the casual ward at Liverpool, it would be a quarter to six in the evening, and there were 26 men who sat there picking oakum; it was a room not more than five feet wide I should say, a long narrow room; it was about the width of an ordinary railway carriage; the men had just room to sit opposite to each other.

2205. Chairman.] How long is the room?

There were 13 men down each side, and the room seemed to be filled with that number; there were 26 men in the place altogether.

2206. There was room enough for them to sit?

Yes, there was room enough for them to sit; they sat opposite to each other. I believe there were no windows in the place, and only an iron grid at the far end of the room which let light and air into the place; there was a great iron door to the room, and the tramp-master told me that the men had been there from half-past six in the morning (it was then a quarter to six at night), and they had not finished their work. The man who sat nearest to us on the left hand, held up his fingers; they were bleeding at the tips; he asked what was to be done with the oakum, as it was not half picked, and this was the state it left his fingers in. Another man on the other side of the room said they were treated as if they were old sailors; that a sailor was accustomed to doing this work and got to have his skin thickened at the tips of his fingers, and it would be no punishment to him. Another man said that when next he wanted a night's lodging he should not come to the tramp-ward for it, but break a window and be taken to gaol, for they were better treated in gaol than in the tramp-ward. Another man was sitting back and doing no work at all, and the tramp-master said to him, "How is it you are doing no work?" "Oh, I can finish mine in five minutes," he said, with a very sullen expression on his face;
face; and the tramp-master said, "Well, finish it, and come out of this," and the man jumped to his feet, and said that it did not matter what came of it; he should attempt to punish the master for that, and would take the consequences. We were then hustled out of the place; the great iron door was banged to; and that was the end of my visit to the tramp ward.

2207. When was this?
Two years ago; it is since the passing of the new Act that enables a tramp-master to keep a man a day and a half in the ward. That seemed to me to be a kind of punishment for mere poverty, which I was ashamed of.

2208. Earl of Aberdeen.] I suppose that a good many of the people who apply for admission to the casual ward are of a somewhat reckless class?
I hear that said; but there is always over against that statement the fact that most of the men know what they are going to receive, and that they do work which is intended to be nine or ten hours' very dismal work, whilst all they receive for it is coffee and dry brown bread; facts which rather indicate that the men are equal to doing some useful work if the work could be given to them. If they work so hard a dismal task of that kind, they might work harder at a better kind of task. The casual ward is just the kind of institution that you would expect to make working men into knaves and dastards, if you only continued the process long enough.

2209. At any rate there is no system, as far as you know, of classification, as between the tramp and the more or less respectable man?
I cannot answer that question; I did not ask that question at the workhouse, and I could only judge from the fact that there were only two rooms.

2210. Are you the author of a book upon the Poor Law?
I wrote a book called "Poverty and the State," giving some of my experiences of the workhouse system, and trying to show that it was possible to give more useful work than this to unemployed people.

2211. Chairman.] I do not know whether I quite gathered your opinion as to out-door and indoor relief; did you say whether you were on the whole adverse to out-door relief?
Yes; I ought to say that I am adverse to all dole-giving, except in cases where the men cannot possibly help themselves.

2212. But how would you define the case of a man who cannot help himself?
I would ask the doctor whether he was fit for any kind of work; and in an agricultural colony you would find work for a great number of men who are ordinarily called incapacible persons.

2213. But let us keep to this matter of out-door relief; then I understand, I think, that you would be in favour of out-door relief to the aged and infirm who could not work?
Yes.

2214. To what class of persons would you confine indoor relief?
I would not give indoor relief at all; having relieved the aged and the sick in other ways, there ought only to be one resource, it seems to me, for other men: either to work if they are able, and to try to better themselves, or to starve down to it until they come back to work again.

2215. Then shall I be rightly representing your view by this: that you are not in favour of out-door relief, in the shape of doles, to able-bodied men, but you are in favour of applying a workhouse test to them, and granting relief to able-bodied men only in the workhouse?
Yes.

2216. But you would be in favour of another system of out-door relief, namely, that of employing persons upon labour outside the workhouse for their own support?
Yes.

(70.)
2217. Then, in point of fact, your evidence comes to this: that you are in favour of a general system of out-door relief?
Yes, if it can be described by an old name, it being such a very different institution.

2218. You mentioned a case of labourers, or a labourer, who had walked as much as eight miles to a labour yard; eight miles there and back, probably you meant?
Yes.

2219. How came it that they were able to obtain relief at a labour yard; were they agricultural labourers within a union where there was a labour yard, in a workhouse, in a town, or what was the actual case?
It was one of the guardians of the poor at Bristol who alleged that more than half the men who were in the stoneyard walked so far; and I gathered the impression that it was because the men lived in Bristol, and their stoneyard was four miles away.

2220. That the stoneyard for Bristol was four miles away from the town? I gathered that impression; it is a rough guess, that.

2221. It seems rather a strange arrangement? It does. I had better only say, perhaps, as much as I know; that the men had walked every day eight miles to work, and there were a large number of them.

2222. You do not know that of your own knowledge?
I only know that it was alleged at one of my meetings nine days ago in Bristol.

2223. Do you think any arrangement could be said to be satisfactory which established a labour yard by which people walked four miles back in order to work at it?
Yes; if the work were worth the doing. If the work were 10 miles away the best part of the men would go to it; it would be no great disadvantage.

2224. You said it was an indication of high moral qualities that men would walk that distance?
Yes, in the case of men who would persistently do it rather than get themselves into gaol, or beg from door to door; these are the only alternatives for a poor man if he cannot get work.

2225. You said that you thought there was more difficulty in obtaining work now than there was 20 years ago, and you found that I suppose upon there being a depression in trade of late?
Partly, and because I have moved amongst the poor a great deal, and have seen some of their struggles to get work. I have known men in Liverpool, in my district, who tried persistently, twice and thrice a day, to get work, first at their own calling, then at any kind of work that would turn up; and I have known cases where a man had within 18 months spent 30 l. of his own savings, and come down to have absolutely no furniture in his house, and got to be desperately poor after doing his best to get work.

2226. Assuming that that may be the case, owing to the continued depression there has been the last two or three years, upon what ground did you extend your observation to saying that there was now less work to be done than in 1834 when the new Poor Law was passed?
That involves rather a long answer. One weaver now can weave in a cotton district 120 yards of calico in a day, where he could only weave 40 or 50 yards then. I can remember the time when two men in agricultural work were sent into the barn to do the threshing of the grain, and were kept there from harvest time until Whitsuntide, and that work is done now in two days.

2227. Your answer really is this: that you think the introduction of machinery has tended to diminish the demand for labour?
Yes, to diminish the demand for the number of individuals. If I might put the
the case more generally, it is this; that I believe the men who are in work of the working classes are better paid than they were then on the whole; but that there are more men out of work, and because of that the wages will tend to come down in time; it is only a question of adjustment.

2228. But will you confine yourself to my question. I gathered that it was your opinion that the diminished demand for labour was caused by the introduction of machinery?

Yes, that is one large cause.

2229. Do you carry that to its utmost extent, and would you say that if all machines were prohibited it would be beneficial to the labouring population?

Oh dear, no.

2230. How far would you go?

I would not go in any direction towards the prohibition of machinery. I think that the surplus labour can be utilized in another way without interfering with machinery; indeed we could not prohibit machinery.

2231. Then I understand you to mean that you do not regard the introduction of machinery as an injury to the human race, but that you think that in consequence of the introduction of machinery some other employment for labour is necessary to supplement the employment by machines?

Yes. I believe that the Poor Law now has a new work to do, because of these modern conditions; another class of the poor has been brought within the influence of the Poor Law, a more deserving class which the State should deal with, because these changes have taken place outside the men themselves.

2232. Then one might roughly divide the population under your scheme in short into two classes; one class to be employed in ordinary labour, and who would have the aid of machinery, and another class who would be employed by the State, without the aid of machinery?

Not necessarily without the aid of machinery.

2233. Perhaps it would be fairer to you to put it in this way: to take off the labour market those men who could not get employment from private capitalists?

To take them off the market, and instead of letting them work for the market to let them work for their own use.

2234. Earl of Aberdeen.] Would it not be rather this: not to take them off the market, but to take those that were already off the market?

Yes.

2235. Chairman.] What you would desire to do is to find employment for those in consequence of the diminution of the demand for labour by reason of the introduction of machinery, are unable to find work in the ordinary manner; is that so?

That is so.

2236. Did you contemplate that the State, in finding work for all these persons, would do so without loss, and that their labour would fully remunerate the State for its outlay?

I believe it would cost at the rate of something like 25,000 l. to establish a colony of about 500 people. It would be a loss, in the first instance, of 25,000 l.; but if the men are allowed to go on as they are doing, unemployed, without any work at all, they will cost the community, either through the poor-rate or through the Charity Organisation Societies, more money than this in 21 years. I mean that the cost of 500 people in a workhouse in 2½ years would amount to 25,000 l., and that it really would be a saving to the community to spend that (and when once spent it would be over) in useful work, rather than let it go out in small driblets in useless work.

2237. Now if this is done extensively, labour would be found by the State eventually for every person who wants it; would not that have a very considerable effect on the increase of population?

(70.) Well,
Well, it is a large question. There are some tendencies that would bring that about, and some that would hinder it; among the poor now the reason why some women marry is that women of the working class can get such very poor wages unmarried; if women had an opportunity of living by their own industry without marrying, they would at least wait longer than they do very often before they married; it would have a tendency to diminish these marriages of convenience.

2238. But you would remove one check to the large increase of population if work had to be found by the State for every person who demanded it?

I am not so sure of that.

2239. You think it might not have that effect?

No.

2240. And do you think that the fund at the disposal of the State is unlimited and could be employed to any extent for this purpose?

Oh, dear no. I think that the proper thing to do would be to carry out say four or five experimental colonies in connection with the larger towns where the surplus labour is most painfully prominent, and in that way to find out by actual experiment whether or not the labour could be utilised.

2241. Do you think that this work could be done without interfering with the work inside of the rest of the community; must it not necessarily enter into competition with the work done by the labourers not employed by the State?

I think it could be done without that. The work could be confined to the providing of butter and milk and meat and vegetables, and the diet in the place could be regulated in such a way that they would need to import very little from outside; they would need to import nothing but materials for lighting and fuel probably, and in exchange for those things they might export certain things that there would be no complaint about, things that we are now importing from abroad, eggs and butter and those things.

2242. But if they produced what was necessary for their own consumption instead of its being purchased from others who produced it, would not that be entering into competition?

I do not think so; because you are dealing with a class of people who sometimes have been living upon one meal a day possibly, and wearing very ragged clothes, and they are not considered good customers to any tradespeople outside.

2243. Whether good customers or not, I suppose they must be customers to some extent?

But it would not injure anybody to have their custom taken away, because a customer who cannot possibly pay his debts is an injury, and not an advantage to a seller.

2244. I suppose that all persons in the long run must pay for what they have: they must, therefore, be customers to some one?

I think a great deal is given to them amongst the poorer classes.

2245. But is not a man who provides for himself by purchasing necessaries from other people a customer to some one?

He is partially.

2246. To whatever extent he purchases, he is a customer to some one?

Yes.

2247. I think you suggested that there was a certain amount of land which is now out of cultivation which might be secured at a reasonable cost?

Yes.

2248. Now, do you think that it would be possible to cultivate that land successfully by labourers brought from towns?

No, unless before going to the town they had been agricultural labourers. But the work in such a colony would require different classes of labourers from the towns as well as from the country. You would have manufacturers as well
as agricultural labourers employed there; you would have tailors, bakers, cooks, spinners, weavers, builders; you would probably be able to employ most skilled workers on their own business; and you would also require some 60 or 70 men who were just rough labourers, who could do nothing more than that work.

2249. If you were to place agricultural colonies in any part of England, would there be, do you think, any danger that the agricultural labourers in those parts might regard the introduction of fresh labourers to compete with them with great jealousy?

I should say not, but that the opposite effect would be produced amongst the agricultural labourers. Any new work which takes an agricultural labourer off the market would rather tend to benefit the labourers in the immediate locality than to injure them.

2250. But I am speaking of the labourers in the immediate locality. Would not an agricultural labourer in Essex feel himself aggrieved at having men brought there from Lancashire to cultivate land at the expense of the State?

I do not think so.

2251. Why should he not?

Nor is it necessary that labourers should be brought from Lancashire in order to do it. The labourers would be found in the vicinity probably. If London attempted to do something of the kind, it would probably take its land in Essex, because cheap land lies near to London in Essex, and the labourers therefore would probably be taken from that vicinity.

2252. Still they would not be Essex labourers?

Some of them would not, probably.

2253. In the cases where these labourers who were to be employed on land had families, would their families be sent with them, and would houses be built for them, or would that be managed?

I think it would be better if the family was kept together, if the men themselves could maintain their families; a shorter period of service ought to be exacted from a man who came without a family, but if he married the period of service ought to be extended according to the number of children that the man had, so that he should feel the burden of his family.

2254. I do not quite understand what you mean by the "period of service"?

I mean the daily period of service. If a man came and had no one to keep but himself, he might do work, say, for six hours a day at some useful work, whilst a man who had three children might be expected to work nine hours a day.

2255. Do I rightly understand you to mean this: that as much labour would be exacted from that man as was necessary for his maintenance, and all expenses connected with it?

Yes.

2256. And that therefore the man who had a family would require to work a larger number of hours on that account?

Yes.

2257. That would be a sort of premium, therefore, upon men not marrying, and so might tend to check the population?

I hope so.

2258. And if the man was accompanied by his family, would you build a separate cottage for them to live in?

I think that would be much better than the present system, and do a great deal of good at very little cost to the State.

2259. In fact, in establishing one of these colonies, you would found a new village or town?

Yes, we should found a new village.

2260. These men would only be temporarily there according to their needs, I suppose; would there be any rule or test to be applied as to the term of their residence, or would they be found labour for an indefinite period as long as they wished to stay?

(70.)
That should be left to be decided by the experience of the colony. My own impression is that the tendency would be for the men to stay there a long time, if they brought their wives and families, and could keep themselves there. It would turn largely upon the conditions outside. If from any circumstances the agricultural depression passed away, and better wages were paid outside, and there was a demand for labour outside, I believe the men would go out. If the agricultural depression increased more men would offer their services. It would regulate itself by the course of events that followed.

2261. Perhaps I do not quite understand; would these men receive any wages, or merely their food and clothing, and lodging?

They would receive their bare food, clothing, and lodging in return for the service that they gave to the village as a community; but the proposal is that in addition they should have a little allotment of land by means of which they could make a beginning if they chose towards getting money; that these amongst them who had capacity for business, or for making any useful things for the market outside, could in that way develop a business; the things to be sold by these men, if there was any complaint, might be restricted to those things which are now imported into England from abroad.

2262. And would there be any rule applied which would have for its object to prevent their condition being better than that of the ordinary agricultural labourers around; or in what way would that be dealt with?

In Holland, at Frederiksoord, they have no rules of that sort; the men are just comfortable; they have a struggle for existence at first; they have their own allotments of land there, and they sell cheese and butter, and such things.

2263. Then I think I understand that you would not make any regulation which would prevent their being in a position equal to that of what I may term the free population in the neighbourhood?

No, except this; that they should earn it for themselves; that should be the only hindrance.

2264. Then, in point of fact, there would be no reason why the labourers should not generally prefer employment in these villages to employment in the ordinary way, because they would be cared for by the State, and relieved from all further care for themselves?

It would be a matter for experiment, entirely, afterwards; it would turn entirely upon the question whether they were self-supporting. All this involves the point of their being able to maintain themselves.

2265. I do not wish to put unfair words in your mouth; but your view is, in fact, the view of the Socialists; is it not?

I do not think so.

2266. I will put the question in another form. How does your view differ from what is usually termed the Socialist view, namely, that the State should employ the whole community?

In this way: the work that is to be undertaken in these villages is to begin and end with the supply of the necessaries of life. In the socialist workshops initiated by Louis Blanc, the State endeavoured to produce articles for the ordinary market, and thus entered into competition with private capitalists. Our colony is to be independent of commerce, whilst his workshops were wholly dependent upon it.

2267. But I thought you said that they would be allowed to sell certain articles?

But necessaries of life only; food and such things as are imported into England from abroad now; and of these things not more than one-fifth of the annual produce would be offered for sale. The villages would be almost self-contained. It is the co-operative rather than the socialist idea.

2268. But have you answered my question as to the difference between the two; would not your system have a tendency to extend to the whole population?

It all depends upon the success of the first experiment, and how far it is successful. The experiment has never been tried on these lines, so as to know whether or not it would be likely to extend.

2269. The
2259. The more successful it was the larger the number of people that would resort to it; would not that be so?
   It would be so.

2270. Therefore, if we assume, as we ought to do in trying any experiment, that it may be successful, the result might be that the entire population of England might be employed by the State?
   The result might be that of course; there is the remotest possibility of it.

2271. How would that differ from the socialistic theory?
   But this is all built upon the supposition that it is going to succeed so far as that. The Poor Law already gives work of a certain kind to the able-bodied poor. The substitution of useful independent work for useless tasks is not necessarily Socialism.

2272. I should like to ask you with regard to what is done in Holland; I think you drew a distinction between the two experiments in Holland?
   Yes.

2273. In the one case, that of the Colony of Veenhuizen, I understand that the people who are sent there are compelled to remain there for a certain time?
   Yes.

2274. In short it is a kind of prison?
   Yes, it is an open air prison.

2275. It is a labour prison?
   Yes.

2276. I think you do not recommend the adoption of that plan in England; I think I understood you to say so?
   No, I should be sorry to see the same thing introduced here, unless it were years hence, as a supplemental thing to a number of places like Frederiksoord, where the men go voluntarily, and stay of their own free will; I mean as a place for compelling men to work who were not disposed to work.

2277. Frederiksoord is a colony of the nature of those which you have been describing as what you would desire to see introduced in this country?
   Very largely.

2278. And it is rather attractive as I gather to the population in Holland if we may judge by the gentleman who could not be kept from coming back?
   The gentleman who could not be kept from coming back was at Veenhuizen at the beggar colony; he was one of the men who had incurred the imprisonment, frequently for the sake of the life at the colony which followed, and was content to remain there and do the work that was required of him.

2279. Now as to this casual ward at Liverpool, have you formed any opinion as to what changes would be desirable in the system of casual wards in dealing with tramps?
   The utter abolition of it, both the casual ward, and the stone yard too, and the substitution of work of the kind I have been describing, which would be ennobling in its tendency, and not degrading.

2280. Should you draw any distinction between those who are known as the casual poor, or vagrants, or tramps, and men not of that class who apply for relief?
   Not at first. If a man came, and would do the stipulated work, he should be allowed to remain if he kept the rules of the place.

2281. I think your objection then is two-fold; one to the nature of the particular ward which you saw, which you thought was deficient in reasonable accommodations, and the other to the nature of the work on which they were employed?
   Reasonable accommodation in the matter of space, do you mean?

2282. Speaking generally, you thought it was not a fit place?
   Yes, I thought it a very unfit place.

2283. That was your objection to the particular ward which you described; but your other objection was a general one to the nature of the labour?
   The nature of the work given; that was my chief objection to it.

(70.)
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2284. Do
2284. Do you think it is desirable, generally, that the paupers should be put to labour of a more profitable nature in the workhouses?
Yes, certainly.

2285. Do you confine that to doing such work as is necessary for themselves within the workhouse, or would you advocate their doing work by which articles could be produced and sold outside?
I would advocate it altogether in connection with the work that they required for themselves, and the sale of things outside should be restricted to such things as could be sold without injury to the home trades. I believe that about four-fifths of the work could be done for use, and about one-fifth for sale; and that one-fifth would include the wages of the Director of the Colony, as it does at Frederiksoord.

2286. But apart from Colonies, taking our workhouses as they are now for the purpose of this question, you recommend that as much work as possible should be done for the workhouse itself by the inmates?
Certainly.

2287. And to that there could be no reasonable objection on the part of those outside, in your opinion?
I think not.

2288. But I think you recognise that there might be a considerable jealousy, as in the case of prisons, of the sale of articles produced within the workhouses?
It should be noticed that the English prisons have not attempted to provide for their own wants, but have gone into business as regular commercial men have done, and have produced articles for sale from the very beginning; whereas this is a proposal that the workhouses should be compelled to produce for use and not for sale.

2289. I want to know whether you think they should also produce for sale in the workhouses; whether, for example, you would be in favour of their producing mats in the workhouses?
I should not. I should be in favour of their producing nothing in the workhouse except such things as we are bringing from abroad; for instance bacon.

2290. Why would you draw a distinction between things brought from abroad and things that we produce at home?
Because we have no right, I think, to tax the public in England in such a way that it shields the manufacturer who is abroad; our first business is to care for our own countrymen; I am afraid I have expressed that very badly indeed. I mean that if we could bring certain things into the market, and offer them for sale alongside of Dutch and French goods, English people would not object to that. French people would, but it is not our business to look after French interests.

2291. What kind of goods?
Eggs for instance, and poultry.

2292. But are not eggs and poultry produced in this country?
They are.

2293. Then would not any eggs and poultry sold by the workhouse compete with the eggs and poultry which I produce?
They would to a certain extent.

2294. You say to a certain extent; why not absolutely?
Because so many more are brought over from Holland.

2295. Surely, if I have a farm in the immediate neighbourhood of a workhouse and I sell eggs and poultry, it is no answer to me if I complain of the competition of the State in selling eggs and poultry from the workhouse, to tell me that eggs and poultry are brought from Scotland?
It makes this difference: that if the English producers are bringing only one-fourth of the supply into the market, and the foreign producers are bringing three-fourths into the market, that is not so bad as bringing in another article, like calico for instance, where probably the whole supply comes from English producers. It is in that sense that I think it is less objectionable.

2296. But you have not answered me why the competition would be less severe to me because eggs and poultry are brought from Holland; I should have thought it would be the other way?

As an individual, no; but upon the whole population it would make a difference.

2297. The Earl of Strafford.] Have you turned your attention at all to the education of pauper children?

No.

2298. I mean the question of boarding out. You have not had any experience of that; you do not wish to offer any opinion as to the advantages of pauper children being boarded out in private homes rather than brought up in workhouse schools?

No, I have no experience of my own to offer on that; I am interested in it, but have not experience to offer on it.

2299. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] You spoke of purchasing agricultural land in the neighbourhood of workhouses for out-door employment; has it occurred to you that there might be considerable difficulty in procuring such land in the case of large towns?

It would be difficult to get the land close to London, but it would not be difficult to get men to go 20 or 30 miles to it; and I think the land could be obtained within that distance. I mean that we are dealing here with a class of men who are able-bodied, and accustomed to walking; you need not even get a railway ticket for these men; if you could assure them that they would get work at the end of the journey they would walk the distance.

2300. Do you not think it would be a little inconvenient for a working man in Lambeth to be invited to go to Essex for his day's work?

I do not myself, because so many men from London went up to a place near Rotherham a few years ago, in order to earn a shilling a day.

2301. You said just now that you would have a sort of village; but it would have to be a very big village that would have to be built for the purpose; I am thinking of London; I have that in my own mind; has it occurred to you how very great the accommodation must be that would have to be provided to carry out the system?

Yes; but then the workhouse system is a very large thing as it is, and it has gradually grown; and this thing would grow according to the need for it. It is the advantage of a small experiment that it would grow accordingly; it is not necessary to begin with a very big village; it is possible to begin with a colony of 500, and in that way we should very soon find out whether it was going to introduce a sort of socialism that would be mischievous to the population. It has not been so in Holland.

2302. Do you think it likely that a body of Poor Law guardians would be more able to cultivate land at a profit than any ordinary farmer or landlord?

Yes.

2303. Why?

They would have a great many advantages on their side. I mean that the ordinary outgoings of a farmer are: first of all, rent, then wages for labour, then cost of manure, then the cost of seed, and he has a fluctuating return to balance these things, and when he is producing for sale the whole question turns not upon his not being able to produce large crops, but upon being able to sell at a profit; he may fail even if he produces 50 bushels...
to the acre; it depends entirely upon some other circumstance, the low price of wheat, for example. But the guardians of the poor would not be troubled by the low price of wheat, because they are going not to sell it but to use it. Then they would have the advantage of being owners of the land they are cultivating, and not renting it. They would get their labour at a less cost, they paying in kind for the labour they had. They would have nothing to pay for manure because the food would be consumed upon the spot, and they would always have enough manure. At Frederiksoord that has been so astonishingly true that the land there has rapidly improved just by putting upon the land the manure of the village. There are three points therefore which a farmer has to contend with, which the agricultural colony would not need to contend with, and by which the agricultural colony might succeed where the ordinary farmer fails.

2304. Has it occurred to you that a great deal of the labour employed on this farm would be unskilled, and therefore not so useful for the purpose of a good financial result as if it were skilled?

No. There is a great deal of skilled labour on the market, and we should begin by taking agricultural labourers, and other workers, and giving them the work that they have been accustomed to.

2305. You see, I have got London in my mind; do you think there is a great deal of skilled agricultural labour in London?

There either is at the docks, or there is agricultural labour coming into London continually; I believe the unemployed labourers could be met and turned in this direction, instead of permitting it to come into London.

2306. That is one point; the other point is this: You thought it would be an advantage for a Poor Law board of guardians in the direction of a profitable result, that they would not have any rent to pay; but they would not get the land for nothing?

No.

2307. They would have interest to allow for that?

Yes, of course.

2308. That would be something in the direction of rent?

Yes, it would be in the direction of rent; but it is obvious that a man who owns his own land may go on farming, and not allow his fields to be desolate, where a man who rents the land would allow them to be desolate; the man who rents the land would certainly abandon it sooner than a man who owns his own land.

2309. Earl of Onslow. Why?

Because the one man has the rent to pay as well as the profit to make, and he gives it up because of the second burden. Admitting that the two men are equally good farmers, the one man owning and the other renting the land, if the tenant has only to pay 10 s. an acre, that 10 s. an acre may be a loss to him.

2310. Lord Sandhurst. What amount of population is there at Kendal? About 14,000.

2311. How are they generally employed; is it an agricultural population?

They are employed in all kinds of work. There is an agricultural population, but in Kendal we produce all the necessaries of life, food, and boots and shoes, and clothing. Woollen cloth and carpets are spun, and woven, and dyed in Kendal.

2312. And do you find that you have a large number of unemployed there?

No.

2313. And, therefore, there are not many of the people in your district migrating towards the bigger town?

No, I should say that Westmorland is one of the most prosperous counties in England at present, so far as the working classes are concerned; that they are in more steady work there than elsewhere; and the agricultural land there, generally, is rented at a higher price than elsewhere.
2314. Lord Thring. I understand that your colony is to produce only for its own benefit, and not to sell; how do you propose to equalise the production with the use; if you had a good season you would produce too much, and if you had a bad season you would produce too little, would you not?

If there were a surplus there would have to be something sold, or else warehouses built to store it up.

2315. It is a matter of notoriety, to you and to me, that one year produces double the quantity of corn, and double the quantity of all the products of life that another year does?

Yes.

2316. When you have a surplus, what do you propose to do with it?

If there is a great outcry about selling it, it could be stored in warehouses; but that would be a more difficult way of doing it.

2317. It would be like Joseph in Egypt?

Yes, it would be that old-fashioned way of storing it up.

2318. Then I understand your colony would be on this wise; in the good years you would garner up for the bad years?

Yes.

2319. Earl of Onslow. I understand you to say that the superiority of your plan over the existing farmer or small holder would be that the manager of this colony would have to pay nothing for his labour; he would have to consume all his produce, and instead of rent he would only have to pay a limited interest upon the capital outlay for purchase of land; is not that it?

Not quite. I said that the labourer would have to be paid in kind, not in money; and therefore the director would not have that difficulty to face, of finding a market for his produce, when markets are over-stocked.

2320. Now suppose an agricultural labourer has a small holding on which he can grow all that he wants for the consumption of himself and his family, upon which he bestows his own labour and the labour of his family, and for which he pays a moderate rent; in what way is he different from the occupants of your proposed village; would he not be on exactly the same footing?

May I ask if you mean that the labourer should use the products of his allotment, of his little farm?

2321. Yes?

Yes, he is largely upon a similar footing, but he has the disadvantage of producing a large number of things upon a much smaller scale. A single family loses all the advantages of division of labour.

2322. That is not an uncommon state of things throughout the country, is it?

For labourers themselves, you mean, to produce for their own use? It is not uncommon in regard to certain things; I mean that they may produce part of their own food; but they do not produce all of it, and they do not produce clothing as well; and the success of this enterprise would turn entirely upon their producing all necessary things, food as well as clothing, and boots and shoes, within the community; otherwise they could not carry on their work at all; I mean that it would fail as other colonies have failed that have attempted in the same way to produce nothing but food. We want to guard against that by making the village self-contained, independent of commerce.

2323. You wish to do away with money as a medium of exchange?

Yes, that is one thing.

2324. Now, in cases in which labourers have had small holdings which they have cultivated themselves, and from which they have received enough for the consumption of their families, do you know whether they have been generally successful?

I should say that they had been successful, because in these instances the men have had nothing to offer for the necessaries of life except their labour. For instance, I see Irish labourers going away to Canada wearing frieze cloth of their own manufacture; at first sight it seems to us that it could pay nobody to weave by hand-loom frieze cloth, that it would be cheaper to buy it; but when (70.)
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you
you remember that these men have no money to give for it, then it becomes quite another matter, and quite practicable. The same conditions will prevail always when very poor people are allowed to have allotments. I believe where the men do produce for use and not for sale, that they can and will produce when employer of labour could not produce the same articles in the same way for the general market without great loss.

2325. Then do I understand you to say that you believe, generally speaking, small holdings cultivated by the family have been sufficient for the means of subsistence of the man and his family?

No, I do not express any opinion on that; that is a totally different thing, producing merely the food, without producing the circle of the necessaries of life. May I put it in this way: that there is a difference which has been long recognised by economists between value in use and value in exchange, and that the value in use never changes, whilst the value in exchange continually changes. This is an attempt to produce for the value in use, and to get out of the difficulty of having to produce for the value in exchange.

2326. Earl of Hopetown.] I think you have expressed yourself in favour of the abolition of the casual ward altogether?

Yes.

2327. And in time, also of indoor relief in the ordinary workhouse?

Except that for old people there should be almshouses.

2328. What would you do with the very large population of vagrants which we have to deal with?

I think the workhouse is too good for idle people; bad as it is now, I think that it is too good for that particular class. It does not deal satisfactorily with any class. Numbers of the deserving poor are badly treated, and the undeserving poor are spoiled by it, I think. I would devise something for men who continued to be idle, very much like the Dutch Beggar Colony, where the men are compelled to work. The proper punishment of a man for idleness is to make him do the thing he does not like, that is to say, work.

2329. But there are very often men going from one part of the country to another seeking for work, and it is very hard to keep them shut up, you may say, in prison for any length of time?

But it would not be a prison, the men would be free to go wherever they chose whenever they had done their work.

2330. Chairman.] But I understand you to say that in Holland they are not free to go?

They are free to go at Frederiksdoord, but not at the Beggar Colony; but the questioner was asking rather in connection with the ordinary agricultural colony and not the penal colony.

2331. I think the noble Lord rather wished to obtain your opinion as to how you would deal with wayfarers, men who were passing from one part of the country to another; how would you do with that class, if there were no casual ward?

I would give them work in the ordinary way at the village, give them the day's work, whatever the stipulated period was; but to a man who admitted that he had come only for a very short period of time I would give a longer period of daily service. If the other people were working eight hours a day he should work 10, say.

2332. Take an ordinary case in the country, where there are applying in the course of the week 20 or 30 vagrants, men who say that they are passing through the country in search of work; those men are now dealt with in vagrant wards, get a night's lodging, and have to perform a stipulated task; how would you deal with that class of men?

In the same way, I would give them a period of work to do for their day's relief, and for their shelter; but the work should be of a better kind than had been given before, it should be a period of service a little longer than the period of service exacted from those men who said that they were willing to stay for a time; because it is obvious that the service of a man who
who comes to a place of that kind, is not worth so much for the first few days as afterwards.

2333. But these men do not wish to do more than to get a night's lodging, and they say they are going forward to some other place; now would you detain them, and for how long?
Eight or nine hours next day.

2334. And what sort of work would you set them?
Two or three questions should be asked of them as to what work they could do best, what second best, and what third best; and we should give them, if possible, the kind of work they have been accustomed to; and if they were fit for nothing else, there would be the piggeries to clean out, and obnoxious tasks of that kind, which could be reserved especially for a class of people we did not want to encourage.

2335. But would it be always possible to find these men the sort of work that suited them?
I think so, with a careful director.

2336. Earl of Hopetoun.] Can you tell me the amount of oakum that men have to pick in the casual wards of workhouses?
I could by referring to papers; I cannot speak from memory.

2337. Am I right in supposing that it is four pounds of oakum?
I think so, but I cannot say with any certainty; it is intended to be nine or ten hours' work, but it is much more than this in the case of men who have not been accustomed to it.

2338. You do not know what the amount is in convict prisons, do you?
No.

2339. Earl of Milltown.] I understood you to say that at the workhouse in Liverpool, the tramp work was intended to last for nine or 10 hours?
Yes.

2340. You are sure that that is the case?
Yes.

2341. If your system was adopted, I understand you would have no workhouses at all?
There would always have to be almshouses, which would be a sort of remainder of the old poorhouse.

2342. You would change the name but leave the institution; is that what you mean?
What do you mean by "the institution?"

2343. You call them almshouses; but would they not in fact be poorhouses just as they are now?
For a certain class of the people: I mean the incompetent people would always need to be cared for in that way; but I believe that the number of these would be greatly diminished if the able-bodied unemployed poor were taken off the market and made to help themselves.

2344. I understood you to say, in the earlier part of your examination, that you advocated out-door relief being given to the infirm and old?
Yes, when there was no danger of it interfering with the labour market.

2345. Then they would not go into the poorhouse?
No.

2346. Then you would have no necessity for the poorhouse?
No, you would not, if this class were entirely provided for in another way.

2347. Chairman.] But you contemplated the possibility of there being some cases where persons seeking relief, and being unable to find a home, would require
require shelter and a home, and for those persons you think something in the nature of an almshouse might be required?

Yes; for those unable to work, and for the sick poor something in the nature of an institution.

2348. Earl of Milltown. With regard to these casuals, you contemplate there being a night’s lodging and food at one of your colonies, I understand?

Yes.

2349. You would have to have a good many colonies I presume, to enable provision to be made for these men in the different parts of the country?

All that would turn upon experiment. It would be possible for every Poor Law union to have its own village, varying in size with the requirements of the union.

2350. You are against the casual ward, you say; but where would you put up the casuals?

I thought that was the last question. In the villages.

2351. Then you would have to provide casual wards in your colonies for the reception of these persons?

Yes. It is not the name that I object to so much as the particular way in which the work is given to them; that a man is given work in the casual ward to do which tends to make him hate work; and that I believe work could be given to him of a kind more profitable to the community, which would tend to make him like his work.

2352. Then your objection to the casual ward as it at present exists, is to the nature of the work which the casual is called upon to do?

Yes.

2353. I understand you to say that under certain circumstances you would detain a poor person in the colony whether he liked it or not?

I should say no to that question in regard to the first colonies that are to be started; there may be another kind of colony established afterwards, a penal colony, where the men could be compelled to stay; but they should be sent there by a magistrate after having been convicted of vagrancy, being idle persons.

2354. If they are convicted of vagrancy they are sent to gaol; you do not want a colony for that?

I am not sure about that, gaols are not so likely to cure idleness as a labour colony.

2355. But I understood you to say that where the persons sent to one of these colonies were unwilling to work, then you would send them to another description of colony, somewhat like the second one in Holland, and there you would detain them whether they liked it or not?

Yes.

2356. Would that differ very much from a prison?

It differs from the prisons that I am acquainted with in England; I mean that it gives work; it all turns upon that, upon the man who would not work before being compelled to do twice as much work as he would have done if he had gone to an ordinary workshop. That is the principle of the treatment in Holland. That at least has the effect of making men do work better afterwards.

2357. Making them work has the effect of making them like it?

Yes.

2358. Lord Balfour of Burley.] I want to get a little more information from you as to the exact relation which is to exist between those who set up these colonies and those who are to work in them. Are the workers to be free to go and come exactly as they please?

Yes, I should say so as a first experiment; it would be best to try the experiment upon those lines before adopting any sort of coercive measure to compel them to remain.
2359. In other words, whenever work is slack everybody may come and
demand work from you, and whenever work is plentiful he may go and get it
for himself?
Yes, I should say so.

2360. He runs no risk whatever in throwing up a situation?
At first he would run a great risk. For instance, a working man who had
been receiving 4 s. 6 d. a day would lose a great deal of that on coming into
a colony, for he would come and get nothing but the bare necessities of life; he
would be put to all the inconvenience of removing himself there, and his family
and furniture.

2361. I thought you were going to do all that for him?
No; the whole principle of the thing is that we do nothing for them in
future but give them the tools and make them do for themselves.

2362. I thought I understood you to say that the man and his family were
to be transported from the town where he failed to get work to this colony?
I endeavoured to give the other impression, that the man should even walk
there, and not have his railway fare paid.

2363. With his family?
Yes, with his family. I hear of working men out of work walking hundreds
of miles.

2364. You have a man in London who applies for relief, and the relieving
officer is to say: “Yes, there is a colony in Essex; walk off with your
family there, and you will get a house and be taken in”; is that to be the
process?
Yes.

2365. Earl of Milltown.] I understood you to say that although you would
not pay these men in the colony anything, you would give them a certain
amount of allotment land in order that they might make something out of it
for themselves, and you suggested that they should be allowed to do such
things as they are allowed to do in Holland, and you instanced butter and milk
as things which they might produce. That suggests the question, where are they
to get cows?
It was, perhaps, an unfortunate choice to make for a beginning. The men
would obviously not be able to buy a cow on their own account until they had
been there for a while, and had accumulated some money, but there is nothing
to interfere with their sending eggs into the market.

2366. Where are they to get the hens?
That is rather a catch question than a real difficulty, is it not?

2367. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Let me ask you if you seriously contemplate
that men out of work, with perhaps a delicate wife and family, are to be
told when they come for relief that they are to walk off 50 or 100 miles to a
colony?
No, I speak very generally; I do not contemplate all men having delicate
wives and families; there would be discretion to be exercised in a case of that
kind.

2368. It would come to this: that if it were found that there was a child
sufficiently delicate to be transported, that family would have to be transported;
every person who did apply would have a member of his family delicate, and
everybody would have to be transported?
I do not think so; I think that the unemployed class, particularly in the
upper stratum, are a class much nobler than that, and you would find them
walking rather than being a charge upon the rates.

2369. No doubt there are many who would be so; I do not wish to detract
from the credit due to them, but there are many who would like to take every
advantage they can; is that not so?
Yes, I am sorry to believe that there are some men of that kind.

(70.)

2370. And
2370. And in setting up a State system you must make provision for every class you have to deal with?

We must make provision for every class, but not necessarily at these colonies. I mean that these colonies may make it their definite work to give work to the able-bodied deserving poor, and we should become possessed of a better test by this means to select the deserving from the undeserving poor than ever has been devised before; we shall be able to offer the man real work that is worth the doing, whereas, hitherto, we have only offered test work, and a man does not throw himself heartily into the breaking up of firewood, because he knows that when he has finished the work the wages he receives will only be half wages, and half dole. It is for the able-bodied poor that the law needs amendment most of all.

2371. I want you to separate in your mind for a moment the deserving and the undeserving; what are we to do with those whom everyone will admit to be undeserving?

I say, turn them out of such a colony as this, and afterwards it will be more difficult for them to beg. Let it be known in that district that the deserving poor are taken in and work given them, and it will undermine the trade of the beggar; but if we find that these men are wilfully starving, or breaking the laws of the country by robbing, they will be dealt with by laws that already exist, and if that is not enough we may devise a penal colony like the one at Veenhuizen. That is for after consideration. It seems most important to deal first with this class of the deserving poor, because from that class all the criminals and prostitutes are recruited.

2372. You want first to start an experiment?

Yes.

2373. And is it to be done out of the rates, or out of private funds?

My motive in coming here is the hope that the Local Government Board should carry on an experiment. I believe an experiment possibly may be tried from private sources, if it is not taken up by Government.

2374. But ultimately you would contemplate the rates being pledged to the success of these agricultural experiments, and if there was a loss it would be provided out of the rates?

Yes; but I see also that there could not be an absolute loss.

2375. Why not?

Because the guardians of the poor stand in a relationship to these men which is entirely different from that of the ordinary commercial man. The ordinary employer of labour has nothing to do with social or humane considerations. If it is 14 s. a week that he pays a man as wages, the labourer must earn that, and something more, or he has done with him. The guardian of the poor is in the relationship, rather of a father towards a son, that is to say, he must keep him with or without work; and therefore, if the guardians employed this man, and he only earns 5 s., and it costs 10 s. to keep him, it would be a saving to the guardians of the poor to give him any kind of productive work.

2376. With regard to the class of persons I was asking you just now about, those who profess to be destitute, but who are not able to do the work in these colonies, what are you going to do with them; men who have fallen from independence by their own fault, by dissipation, and in other ways; how are you going to deal with them?

I would say that it is not any part of our work to deal with them; it should be a colony that takes in the able-bodied, deserving poor, and the first test would be; is the man able-bodied, able to work then; is he willing to work. If not, he would be sent off to the hospital, or the proper place.

2377. Your whole scheme only deals with the able-bodied and deserving?

Yes.

2378. Then
2378. Then what are you going to do with those not deserving; must you not keep up the machinery of the present system to deal with them?

At the beginning. The founding of one or two experimental colonies would not interfere at all with the Poor Law, and would not immediately affect it.

2379. These experimental colonies, I think I understood you to say, are to be self-sustaining, but not anything more; there is to be no sale of their produce more than will pay expenses.

I hope not; but that could be arranged, if it so far succeeded; a tax could be put upon the men who were there. If 450 acres would keep 500 men for instance, they could be compelled to work 500 acres, so that the produce of that extra land could be sold in the market for extensions, buying of new land, and so on. But the first thing, it seems to me, is to show clearly that these men can be helped to keep themselves, and in that way save their characters from being pauperised; that relief could be administered by which they should not lose their sense of independence; that if they ever did go out again they would go out with the consciousness that while they had been there they had at least been keeping themselves; that they had not been a tax upon people upon whom they had no claim.

2380. They would only consume, according to your plan, that with which they supplied themselves from their labour?

Yes.

2381. But there are many things which it would be impossible for them to get, would it not; what would they do for such matters as tea and coffee, or rice and sugar?

Some of these things would have to be purchased from outside; but it is quite possible to give very good diet without tea or coffee. The unemployed poor are living without things much more important than those at present. It would be possible to give them meal and milk and butter, beef, mutton, and bread enough, without going outside; and a man who has enough of those things is not in a very bad case, even if he does not get either tea or coffee.

2382. Chairman.] A good many things would be left to be bought, brick, if there was no brick-earth, timber, and the materials for building; and in the county of Essex a large number of things would have to be bought from outside?

Yes.

2383. Then you would have to change the products of labour on the farm for them, would you not?

No, I hope that the first cost will be covered by either a public subscription or by a grant of public money for the building of the place, I mean the material for the building.

2384. Lord Balfour of Burley.] In any experiment which you made you would have the power of picking, and probably would pick, the persons whom you would put to work on the colony?

Yes, to some extent. I would make up my mind before offering employment how many agricultural labourers I wanted, how many spinners, weavers, and dyers, how many shoemakers and tailors, how many cooks and laundresses, and I would have a general idea of how many of these people I wanted. Then I would select them, and when I got my 40 agricultural labourers for instance, I would not engage another until more land had been added to the colony.

2385. So that to that extent the experiment you would make would be no real guide as to the possibility of doing this all over the country, because if it were part of a general system you could not pick the number of people from each trade that you wanted, but you would have to take the number of people that came to you?

I do not think that that would be found to be a great difficulty in practice, because now there is a tendency, an inevitable tendency, for the trades to be equally over-stocked. You would find always that if in the shoemaking trade

(70.)
for instance, there was a special demand for labour in a very short time that would be supplied, that there is a tendency to equalise the supply of labour in the various trades. You will find in every trade that there are some men out of work.

2386. With regard to the time you were in Liverpool, between what years was it that you were there?

Part of 1884, 1885, 1886, and 1887.

2387. How far would you go in making casual wards more comfortable than they are at the present time?

I do not think it necessary to make them more comfortable in the ordinary sense; they ought to be made less demoralising; it is not necessary to give either better food or better housing; but if you gave a perfectly simple diet, such as is now given, then you could only exact a very short period of service for it. I would let that question of comfort turn upon the amount of work that a man did of a profitable kind.

2388. If you had to deal with a class of vagrants and wayfarers, which is the case at the present time, you would not advocate the making of their condition as good as that of those who provide their own lodging; it must be something appreciably worse, must it not?

Yes, it would be so, I am sure.

2389. Did you make any complaint about the state of matters which you found in the particular tramp ward which you visited, at the time?

Yes; I spoke to Mr. Haggard, who is the vestry clerk there. He did not actually go with me into the ward, but he sent one of the men with me into the ward, and we talked about it afterwards, and he said, "Well, you know the theory of the workhouse is that it is a place that is made intentionally uncomfortable for the poor; that we do not intend this place to be a place that will be attractive to the poor people." That was the only remark he made about it when I pointed out these things; and when I pointed out to him the case of a woman I had known myself who was doing useless work who could be employed in tailoring, he said, "I suppose they have not inquired carefully into that case;" and then he took me into the bakehouse and showed me that out of 14, six or seven were inmates who were doing a kind of work that would seem to be useful work; but when I came to inquire into these particular cases I found another kind of injustice that seemed quite as bad; I mean that a man was taken, and being a pauper, was compelled to do the same kind of work which an ordinary tradesman from outside was doing, and for which he would receive about 26s. per week. But although he worked and did as much in the way of making bread as the other man, he did not receive 26s., but simply his workhouse keep.

2390. Do you advocate that he should have received the 26s. or any part of it?

As a matter of bare justice he deserved more than his workhouse keep for all this work.

2391. Why?

Because he had earned it; he was doing work worth in the labour market 25s. or 26s.

2392. But if he was doing that, why then was he in the workhouse?

Because the difficulty is not a difficulty of finding men who have got skill in their fingers, but a difficulty of finding a market for their produce afterwards. There are a number of men, willing to work, who cannot get work because all the produce markets are overstocked.

2393. If that man was badly used in the workhouse, why will your friend in the colony be well used if he does not get more than just enough to keep him?

Because he would not be compelled to work so long a period.

2394. Then the grievance was, not that he had to work, but that he did not get the produce of his work?

Yes; but it would not have mattered so much if he got any credit for it, the man
man was doing more in comparison to his means than any other man in Liverpool, for the welfare of the town. I mean that as a working man he gave, I suppose, 20s. a week in value towards the maintenance of the poor, over and above keeping himself, and got no credit for it.

2395. With regard to the instance of the man who went eight miles to and from the stoneyard, that is eight miles altogether?
Yes.

2396. How long is it since you became acquainted with that case?
Not more than a fortnight; and it is not one case, it is a multitude of cases. I was lecturing in Bristol, and a number of the guardians of the poor were present, amongst them the chairman; and various guardians of the poor got up and spoke of the proposed amendment in the Poor Law, and in regard to the success of a colony of this kind; and amongst others, one guardian said that he believed that, generally speaking, the paupers now in the house were too degraded or too feeble to do this work, yet he believed there was a class outside the workhouse that would be greatly benefited by a change of this kind, and that it would touch first of all the class of people who come to the stoneyard; not the in-door poor, not the out-door poor, not the men in the casual ward, but those in the stoneyard, he believed, were the class of persons who would work here; and he instanced this fact, that they had a hard day's work to do for very little pay, and that a great number of them walked miles in going to and from the yard.

2397. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have you been led to advocate an experiment in the way of a colony by finding from personal observation that there is a very large amount of distress among the poor, not met by the present system?
Yes.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Reverend Prebendary Billing, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

2398. Earl of Aberdeen.] You are Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Spitalfields?
Yes.

2399. Are you an elected Poor Law guardian?
Yes.

2400. What was your previous experience as a London clergyman before going to Spitalfields?
My experience was in the North of London, in Barnsbury.

2401. You were vicar there?
Yes, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Barnsbury.

2402. Do you hold the opinion strongly that the province of the Poor Law is to relieve destitution, and not to undertake any action which might discourage providence, or relieve parents of their responsibilities?
Decidedly.

2403. I presume from that that you would object to anything like a general system of out-door relief?
Certainly, in the interests of the poor themselves.

2404. Can you give us any information as to the distress of last winter, as to whether it was greater or less than usual?
In the East-end of London I think the distress was last year about the same as the two previous years. There has been a considerable improvement since September twelvemonth in work; there had been more trade going on, but it was not sufficient to make any great difference in the labour market. Still, there was improvement, but then we suffered largely from continued immigration of foreigners, who, though they may not come on the poor rates themselves, drive
drive Englishmen on the poor rates and make them paupers; and then we also suffered from the large amount of immigration from the country districts. Those causes largely tended to make the distress of last winter extremely difficult to deal with.

2405. In other words, there were a large number of unemployed persons:
A large number of unemployed, in addition to that large number which there always is during four or five months of the year, who, if they were thrifty and provident, earn sufficient to maintain themselves in comfort during the whole of the 12 months. I have been sitting, if I might mention it just now, on the committee appointed by the Lord Mayor to endeavour to utilise the work that has been done by the Public Gardens Association through the grant of the Mansion House Relief Fund, to prevent those who have had temporary work being, at the same time in the following year, in the condition in which they were before. Now, the greater number of the men who have come on those relief works were men who should have needed no such relief work at all; they were men who had plenty of work; they have good wages during eight or nine months of the year; but during the slack time they are, and always will be out of work.

2406. You mean that they do not save?
They do not save; and then when there is no work for them to do, immediately they have to fall back upon private charity, or upon the Poor Law.

2407. Would you state the different causes which you think have increased this distress. You have already mentioned foreign immigration?
There is foreign immigration, and immigration from the provinces, and then improvidence; and what I lay very great stress upon is improvident marriages; that is one of the most fruitful causes of distress; there can be no doubt about that.

2408. Before going further upon those points, I should like to ask if in your experience the Poor Law is adequate for meeting the distress arising from these various causes?
The Poor Law is adequate to meet destitution; but it is absolutely necessary in order that the Poor Law should do its work that there should be a abundance of co-operation with outside charities. The reform which of all others I think we need is the increase of that co-operation on some well-ascertained and recognised basis.

2409. In the district for which you are a guardian is there any systematic co-operation of that kind.
Yes.

2410. Perhaps you will describe it?
In the first place, we have practically abolished out-door relief in the Whitechapel Union. That was not done by a stroke of the pen, but it was the result of the policy that was adopted. That policy was adopted in the interests of the poor themselves. But for the purpose of assisting those who under the old system might have had out-door relief, there was founded what is known as the Tower Hamlets Pension Society. That operates in this way. We will suppose that there is an old couple who under the old plan would have received out-door relief, or partial relief, and have been compelled to supplement it by begging. The Tower Hamlets Pension Committee inquires into the case; and if they show providence and thrift, and if those who ought to do something to assist them, their children or other relatives or friends, will come forward and do a certain part, then the Tower Hamlets Committee will give them a permanent pension; and that pension is not merely after the old fashion of a Poor Law dole, only enough to keep body and soul together, and perhaps not that, but really enough to keep them in respectability and in comfort. Then, besides that, I hold that a great deal of good has been done in the Whitechapel district by co-operation with outside charities; with the Charity Organisation Society; the Society for the Relief of Distress, and with all local agencies, the object of the guardians being that when anyone has come under the operation of the Poor
Poor Law, he should, if possible, be dispauperised. The guardians conceive it to be their duty not only to relieve his destitution for a time, but to see whether they cannot in co-operation with friends outside give the man some hope of not settling down to permanent pauperism, give him some hope of earning a living for himself; and the Whitechapel guardians are most anxious to co-operate with outside agencies, not only for the young boys and girls and children, who may come under their care, but also for the able-bodied men; indeed, for those who are not able-bodied.

2411. There is no labour yard in Whitechapel?
No; the labour yard has not been touched there for the last 17 or 18 years. The fact is, that when it was opened, it was found that they were really not the deserving poor that came there; not those that we really wanted to help.

2412. Judging from what you have said, and from what others have told us, there is great want of uniformity of administration in the different unions; is that, in your opinion, a hindrance to successful Poor Law administration?
Yes, I hold that that is one of the greatest hindrances to successful Poor Law administration at the present time. One board of guardians will administer its relief on one principle; next door they will do it on another. In one Poor Law union they neither make nor neglect paupers; and in the next district they will be doing both, making them and neglecting them at the same time.

2413. Can you suggest any possible remedy for that state of things?
I should like to see a very great reform in Poor Law administration. I should like that the Local Government Board had more authority given to it by statute to provide for uniformity of administration, especially in the metropolitan area, where it is very disadvantageous to the work of those who are endeavouring to diminish pauperism to find so much variety of administration in the different unions.

2414. With regard to Whitechapel, what is done in the way of classification of the inmates of the workhouse?
We have endeavoured, as far as possible, to classify the inmates, under the persuasion that if you allow a mixed body to get into the workhouse and to mingle together, as they must do there, during the greater portion of their time, when they are not at labour, but are either at meals, or occupying that enormously long period which is given to sleep, which cannot be fully occupied in that way, you are taking the most fruitful step towards demoralising the whole community. Therefore we endeavour, as far as circumstances will permit to classify the paupers to prevent their mixing together so as to contaminate one another; and with the consent of the Local Government Board, which Board found itself without power to allow us to engage a schoolmaster to teach the adults, we have been allowed to have two "mental instructors" for the purpose of assisting the adults, one for the men and one for the women; who occupy that time which would otherwise be spent in idle gossip after their last meal, and before they retire to rest, in reading to them and encouraging them to read and giving them instruction, but especially endeavouring to discover what could be done to help them, and to try to sow the seed of hope in their hearts again.

2415. That is a salaried official to whom you are referring?
Yes; a man and a woman; a man for the men, and a woman for the women. Then we have considerable co-operation with ladies who visit regularly, not merely as visitors to stay to have a little chat with the old people, and to give them spiritual comfort, but really for the purpose of catching hold of those people whom we may have there, and we keep books in which entries are made of the different cases, and they are referred to such agencies outside as are likely to assist them.

2416. What is the system adopted by your board as to children; have you district schools?
We have district schools, and in our district schools we have been doing as
much as we can of late to train the children that they may not, when they go out, simply be turned out of an institution where everything has been done for them, even their food cooked in such a way that they have never had an opportunity of learning how food would be cooked in an ordinary house. Everything is done there in a great way; but we have had lately, for instance, a class of girls; those girls are elder girls who have been some time in the institution. Not only are they taught ordinary household work, but they are entrusted with housekeeping business; they have so much allowed them, and with that they have to go out and shop and learn, under the superintendence of a matron, how much a shilling is worth, and how far it will go, and how they best can expend it; so that when they go out and have to keep house quite by themselves they may not be altogether at sea; or that, if they go to domestic service in the meantime, they may be better qualified for the work.

2417. Has there been time to estimate the result of this system?  
Yes; we have had time to do that, and we have found it very beneficial. Of course some who have had the advantage of this system have disappointed us; that you must expect, but it has had certainly a most beneficial effect on the majority of the children who have come under it.

2418. Have you adopted the system of boarding out children?  
Yes, for children that we can board out; but, as your Lordships know, we are restricted to those who are orphan children, or deserted children without any probability of those to whom they might belong turning up to claim them.

2419. Would you like to see the facilities in that respect enlarged?  
No; for my own part I think that the facilities are equal to the circumstances. I object as strongly as anyone can to large institutions, in the interest of the children, whether boys or girls, placed there; but large institutions are absolutely necessary when you remember the number of children there are, whom, as I think, it would not be wise to board out, because if their own parents could claim them there would be a risk of their being demanded as soon as they had really engaged the affections of their foster parents. And then there are a number of children who, unfortunately, will be always going in and out of the workhouse, so long as this civilised country continues to adopt the system of the present Poor Law, which gives to any rogue and villain the right to demand assistance and relief. He may turn out one morning and he can require, as a matter of right, to be taken in 24 hours afterwards, when he comes back, and to be bathed and treated as if he were the most proper member of society.

2420. The guardians have no means, have they, of dealing with that class of people, the in-and-out paupers, except in some indirect manner?  
Only in an indirect manner. If they had authority given to them to detain paupers, so as to have the opportunity of really training them for some good work, I believe that the evil of the present Poor Law system which is undermining the independence of the people would be largely mitigated.

2421. Does it seem to you a defect in the system that a man who goes to a casual ward is almost as a matter of course subjected to a more or less penal discipline and treatment, whereas an idle fellow in the workhouse has no worse treatment than a deserving person who applies for relief?  
Yes; and that man may constantly repeat his application, and if he happens to be a pensioner it is very difficult to attach his pension. There are a great number of Army pensioners with us who are living a great portion of their time on the earnings of those who have great difficulty in paying their rates. Your Lordship has referred to casuals; for my own part I would close every casual ward in London to-night with the greatest satisfaction if I could do so. There is no longer, I believe, any need for a distinction between the casual and the ordinary pauper. I have had perhaps as much experience as anyone in the visitation of a casual ward; for the last 10 years I have been a constant visitor in the White-chapel casual ward, which takes in casuals from other districts, and has been to a large extent under my own personal supervision; I have
have had to do with them by day and night, and know the class well, and as far as my experience goes I am convinced of this, that it takes about three weeks to make a casual. If you catch a poor young fellow before he has been made a casual, you may save him. If the master of our casual ward saw to-night some one applying who he was sure ought not to be in the casual ward, he would not hesitate to send him to me at once that he might be saved from the contamination of getting into the casual ward, but if you cannot take them in hand before three weeks or so, it is almost hopeless; they settle down, and become a particular class.

2422. How is it that the severity of the discipline and the discomfort of the casual ward do not deter them from resorting to it again?

It is one of the mysteries which it is very difficult to solve; but the fact is, that when a man has once become a casual, there is not much hope of his ever becoming anything else. He does get there a sufficiency of food; you never saw a casual who was ill-fed; I have seen hundreds of casuals stripped, and I may say that I never saw a casual who was an ill-fed man; he is not the man who is found lying out in the street, and on whose body an inquest is held in the morning, and who is said to have died, and perhaps did die, from starvation accelerated by exposure; that man does not belong to the casual class, he has never been in a casual ward.

2423. At Stepney they have done away with the casual ward?

Yes, but that is contrary to law.

2424. Has that fact increased the number of applicants to adjoining unions?

I cannot say that it has.

2425. What is the course resorted to by a working man who is a wayfarer who wants a night’s lodging?

If he were a respectable man, he would keep away from the casual ward; he would rather sleep anywhere than in the casual ward; it is a system of deterrent to prison without having the advantage of being taken before the magistrate.

2426. Do you think that there is a great deal of suffering and privation caused owing to the difficulty that such a man as you speak of would find in getting any sort of shelter?

There is at times, but as a rule the bond fide wayfaring man is a very scarce article now. Those men who are connected with particular trades will always be sent on by their own trade societies. The time was when the casual ward might have been required, but I do not think it is a necessity now. I would give to the guardians the power of receiving that man, the man whom your Lordship speaks of as the bond fide casual wayfarer; let the guardians receive him without having to put him to the degrading work of the casual ward; let them receive him into the workhouse, and give him proper shelter and food, and, if they are satisfied that it is a proper and bond fide case, send him on at six or seven o’clock the next morning, or any time they think proper. I would give them certain discretion.

2427. Chairman.] How would you discriminate between the bond fide cases and others?

I should have very little difficulty in recommending it without fear of failure when you have really satisfactory officers for your different workhouses; it is wonderful how quickly they can discriminate between the man who is an imposter and the man who is not.

2428. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have not the guardians power now to admit into the workhouse a man who is a bond fide wayfarer, and wants a night’s lodging?

They have the power to do so, but it is not the rule to do so; but the rule is for that man to go to the casual ward. The guardians who seek to do their duty by the poor in that way are constantly violating the regulations of the Local Government Board.
2429. Earl of Milltown.] You would leave it to the master to discriminate:
The guardians would be responsible, and they would have to delegate their
responsibility to the master.

2430. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have you resorted to emigration of children from
the rates?
Yes. We have not had many children emigrated; I believe we might
emigrate more. We should like to see some of the restrictions which the Local
Government Board impose removed

2431. But you have power to emigrate from the rates?
Yes; but we should like to have power to spend a little more on the
children. It is difficult to emigrate them under the regulations of the Local
Government Board with regard to the emigration of paupers.

2432. Would you like to see power given for the emigration of adults out of
the rates?
No, I should not like to see that enlarged; I would rather emigration were
done outside the Poor Law.

2433. With regard to co-operation on the part of charities, are the charitable
funds administered in your union mainly derived from the locality, or from
other sources?
From other sources; we cannot raise money in our own locality; we can
spend it, that is all we can do?

2434. There are very few wealthy people in it?
Very few; and in the case of those whose business is there their interest is
very largely removed from the neighbourhood; they have little interest,
extcept in the neighbourhood in which they reside, and where their families
reside.

2435. As a matter of fact, would you say that the system is a system of
relieving the rates by private charity?
I should hardly say so. The Poor Law should just deal with absolute destitution,
and you should encourage co-operation with charitable institutions outside
for the purpose of dispauperising.

2436. And in your experience the adoption of that system has been very
effective in enabling out-door relief to be largely dispensed with?
Yes. Where out-door relief is given I hold that it should be adequately
given.

2437. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You do not specify the restrictions upon the
emigration of paupers which you would like to see dispensed with?
It is simply the restriction as to the amount which we are now allowed to
exped. It is very difficult to emigrate a girl within the limit of the amount
authorised by the Local Government Board.

2438. How far would you go?
We only want two or three pounds more.

2439. What is the amount at the present time?
I speak under correction; I think it is 10 l., and we want 12 l. I was
speaking with the clerk of our board of guardians only within the last few
days about it. We found a difficulty in the case of some we wanted to
emigrate.

2440. What do you spend the 12 l. for?
For the outfit and for the passage.

2441. How much is passage and how much is outfit of the 12 l.?
I cannot say exactly.

2442. Chairman.] At the present time the ordinary labourer can emigrate
from the Eastern Counties to Canada for between 5 l. and 6 l.; how is it that
you require so much larger an amount?

Because
Because with a child you have not only to provide the child with an outfit, but to pay for the child's passage, and to provide for the care of the child while it is on its journey, and also for the care of the child in Canada until a foster parent has been found for it; so that we have to depend upon the terms which Miss Alexander and Miss Rye will make with us.

2443. Earl of Milltown.] I should like to ask you a question about foreigners. I understand you to say that they do in your district interfere very largely with the labour market?

Very largely.

2444. Is there a very large population of foreigners?

Yes. The population of Jews may be indicated by this fact: Within a radius of 200 yards of the parish church of Spitalfields there is the Jewish Free School with 4,000 children; another Jewish infant school with over 2,000 infants; in the first of the School Board schools, Old Castle street (I am chairman of the local managers of that district) there are now about 1,500 children; there are not 20 Gentiles in that school; three other large Board schools in the neighbourhood are fast becoming Jewish schools. That indicates a very large population of foreign Jews. But the question arises, are not a large number of these children that have been born in the country. Now, if you go into the schools and ask the question, you will find that a very large number of these children were born abroad; and in our Board schools there, we have the greatest difficulty now in providing for the education of the children, because they know not a word of English. If the children had been brought up in England they would have some little knowledge of English. The fact is that there is still, and has been for some time, a constant stream of foreign immigration, and that immigration dispossesses the English labourer of his work; and though the foreigner is not found in your workhouses to any great extent, yet at the same time he is responsible for a great deal of the paupers of his neighbour.

2445. He does not, as we know from a previous witness, very often come upon the rates; but that applies chiefly to the Jewish immigrants, who are looked after?

They are looked after by the Jewish Board of Guardians to a large extent. Though they do all that men might be expected to do, still the condition of the poor Jewish immigrants is something frightful.

2446. And a danger, I suppose, to public health?

A great danger; it is impossible for Gentiles to live near them; and when a quarter has once been possessed by the Jews, it is never repossessed by the Gentiles; and the Jewish quarter is continually increasing to such an extent that it is very evident that it is not by the mere normal increase of population; there must be a fresh importation; in fact, that importation takes place every week.

2447. Is that increasing?

No, people have had some fear that it would be increased, but I cannot say that it has increased at present; but it is still going on.

2448. Are these pauper foreigners who come in there chiefly Jews?

Yes, chiefly Jews; and they are in a state of absolute destitution, waiting for those who will take them under what is termed the sweating system, and give them shelter and clothes and food; and they get out of them all the labour they can.

2449. In that way they undersell our working men?

Yes, discredit English manufacturers.

2450. Do you advocate the exclusion of absolutely indigent foreigners from our shores?

Yes; it is a very difficult question; I should strongly advocate that nothing should be done that would prevent England from offering an asylum to those (70.)
that were fleeing from persecution of whatever kind; but on the other hand I am sure, in the interest of those poor creatures themselves (and I see a great deal of them), it would be very desirable to prevent their landing here in the condition in which they are; indeed the Jewish authorities themselves feel that; the Deputy Chief Rabbi, for instance, has done all in his power to stop this immigration, and has warned the people that London, instead of being paved with gold, is full of the cries and means of the starving and the destitute; he quoted the words to me.

2451. Chairman.] Do you suppose that these persons are worse off here than they were in the countries from which they came?
I fancy they are.

2452. Have you any means of knowing?
I have no very satisfactory means of knowing, except from the people, to some extent, themselves; and you see here they are in a different climate altogether many of them.

2453. Earl of Milltown.] Even if they were as badly off, or even worse, in their own country, perhaps you think it is not altogether fair that we should be burdened with them here?
Certainly not.

2454. Chairman.] If they are not worse off here than in their own country it would follow that the ground of interfering with their immigration would really be the injury that it would be to our own workmen?
Quite so.

2455. Earl of Milltown.] You said that you found that a large number of the labouring class, if they possessed the virtue of providence, would be able to live all the year round on what they earned during the season when work is plentiful?
Yes.

2456. And you seemed to say that they do not save up on account of charity and the Poor Law, which saves them from the misfortune which otherwise their improvidence would bring upon them?
I think both casual charity and the expectation of having the Poor Law to fall back upon and keep them from starving if they are improvident, are to a great extent responsible for their improvidence.

2457. Do you think if there were no such sources to fall back upon they would be more likely to care for the future?
Yes.

2458. About early marriages; you look upon that as a very great evil?
I do.

2459. Do not you think there would be a further increase in the population, even if marriage were prevented, owing to the considerable amount of immorality that prevails?
No.

2460. Is not your experience that there is a considerable amount of immorality?
There is a considerable amount of immorality, but I do not think it would be increased at all by forbidding immature marriages.

2461. But though marriages are responsible for a large increase in the population, are there not a considerable number of illegitimate births?
No, not in London.

2462. Earl of Hopetown.] With regard to these very early marriages, do you not think that the very fact that a girl knows that a man will marry her if she gets into trouble very often encourages her to go wrong?
Yes.

2463. And,
2463. And, therefore, if these very early marriages were prohibited, there would probably be less immorality:
I believe that the young women would be much more careful in associating with the young men on familiar terms if they had not the expectation of early marriage.

2464. I suppose it is the recognised thing amongst those people that if a woman finds herself in the family-way they must marry her?
They must "do their duty by her." The time was when I have, in my own parish, facilitated such marriages as a matter of course, when I knew a woman was in the family-way. I should not do that now except under very exceptional circumstances, because my experience is that the majority of those marriages turn out very unhappily; that the man has no respect for the woman and the woman no respect for the man.

2465. You mentioned, in the course of your evidence, that there was an enormously long period given to sleep in the workhouse.
Yes.

2466. Could you state what it is?
In the summer, the usual hours are from eight o'clock in the evening until a quarter to six in the morning, and during the winter from eight o'clock in the evening to a quarter to seven in the morning. The difficulty is to find occupation for the people without sending them to bed; and my experience is such that, for my own part, I should like to see in every workhouse separate cubicles. It would be an expensive thing at first, but it would prevent a great deal of demoralisation.

2467. Are the inmates allowed to speak to one another in the dormitories? They are forbidden; but it is utterly impossible with such a staff as the master of a workhouse has, to avoid a large amount of conversation going on. It need not be loud to be very general and very productive of evil; because classification, however you may attempt it, cannot be successfully carried on as long as you have the large dormitory system.

2468. Is there any punishment on inmates who break the rules in that respect?
There is very little punishment at the disposal of the master of the workhouse; he can reduce their diet, but it is not very grand as it is at present, and a magistrate would hesitate to commit because a man was charged with using corrupting language in the dormitory, unless it was something of a very outrageous character.

2469. Would a cubicle prevent that?
If it were sufficiently divided to prevent conversation.

2470. Would this cubicle be completely shut off from others?
The cubicle, as we understand it, would be open above.

2471. Can you tell us the amount of oakum that a casual is bound to pick in the workhouse.
I am sorry to say I could not tell you at the moment; I am a bad hand at figures in that way. I object to oakum picking.

2472. What labour would you substitute instead of the oakum picking.
For my own part I should like to do away with the casual ward altogether, and with it I should do away with oakum picking. We endeavour, as far as possible, to find other occupation for the men. For instance, our casual ward is close by our large infirmary, and we draft the men over there in the morning, under proper supervision, and let them do a great deal of the house-work; they bring all the coals, which are taken round to the different wards, from the cellars, of course, under careful supervision; they do a great deal of work of that kind in the infirmary; and so we reduce, as far as possible, the number of those whom we are obliged to put to oakum picking.

(70.)
2473. Earl \textit{Spencer.}] I think I heard you say that you have a great number of Jews in your district?

Yes.

2474. Are you acquainted with the way in which the Jewish Board of Guardians work?
Yes, we co-operate with them.

2475. Do they practically administer relief in the same way the Poor Law guardians do?

No, not exactly in the same way that the Poor Law guardians do. They have of course, no opportunity of imposing the house-tax; all the relief they give must be in money or in kind.

2476. But not having that test, do you think they get imposed upon much?

No, I do not think that they are much imposed upon. I think that for the most part they have a pretty fair knowledge of the people; they do their work very thoroughly, and they have very competent officers, thoroughly trained officers, for their work.

2477. But not having the test, they give practically a great deal of out-door relief?

Yes; and one way in which they have increased the difficulties of Poor Law Administration in our district, if I may mention it, is this: that for some time they have been giving a great amount of out-door medical relief, and they have found that it is utterly impossible for them to continue that system; and the consequence is that these foreigners who before received readily out-door medical relief from the Jewish Board of Guardians, come upon the rates. They send for an order upon the doctor on the least possible cause, and, as your Lordships know, that is one of the first steps towards becoming a pauper, generally the first. Very often with those who have a great deal of self-respect otherwise, the first step is getting medical relief. Many a man who would not go for a loaf of bread will go for medical relief, and once having tasted the sweets of being provided for out of the earnings of others, he is liable to come for other relief.

2478. And in that way you think that the Jewish Board of Guardians have not had a good effect?

No, and they see it too; and they have withdrawn, in our district, the medical relief to a large extent; and therefore it is that these poor people are coming to our parish doctor.

2479. But with regard to the other relief that they give, does it in any way affect wages or have a demoralising effect upon the people relieved?

I cannot say that it has a very demoralising effect, because there poor creatures are in such a low state that it would be almost impossible to demoralise them further than they are already, these poor destitute foreigners.

2480. But would you draw a comparison between the mode in which the Jews are relieved by their own body and the mode in which other poor are relieved, and say that the former was more demoralising?

No, I have not noticed that.

2481. You do not think it unduly attracts people to the district, this system of relief?

No, I think the Jews are attracted to the district simply because they must live together owing to their habits and customs; and therefore, it is that in Spitalfields we receive nearly all the Jews on their first arrival.

2482. You do not think that this system of organised relief of Jews itself attracts many destitute Jews from other countries?

I cannot say; I do not know what relief they get there.

2483. I presume there may be organised relief which does really as much harm as a loose way of giving out-door relief?

Quite so.

2484. But
2484. But you would not apply that to the Jewish Board of Guardians?

As far as my experience goes (and we have had some experience in co-operating with them; we always do that when we can), I have found that they have administered their funds to the best of their ability in a very fair manner. I do not think that such charity is the best form of relief, but they have administered it as well as they could.

2485. You were speaking of medical relief; have you any medical clubs in your district?

Yes.

2486. Voluntary ones?

Yes.

2487. And a considerable number of them?

Yes; and as far as the Whitechapel Board of Guardians are concerned, when anyone applies for medical relief, and an order is given by the relieving officer, the guardians place him on loan when his case comes before them, unless they find that there has been some attempt at providence, and that the necessity of sending for the parish doctor was such that the applicant could hardly be expected to avoid doing so.

2488. If a man refuses to pay the loan, have you any power of enforcing it?

Yes; the relieving officer reports that such and such a man applied for medical attendance for his wife, and the doctor was sent; the case comes before the guardians on the report of the relieving officer; the case is investigated, not by any committee of the guardians, by no relief committee, but by the board of guardians itself sitting in the ordinary way of business; and if in their judgment the man ought not to have had such relief, it is placed on loan, and the proper officer applies for it, and to a very large extent we recover those loans.

2489. Is there a great deal of out-door medical relief given in your district?

No.

2490. Has it been diminished lately?

No; I think it is about stationary.

2491. Medical extras, like wine; things of that sort?

No; they are not largely given. We should not give any out-door relief if we could avoid it; but if the patient is not in a position to be removed to the infirmary, of course we should adequately deal with the case.

2492. We heard the other day that in some districts the out-door-patient letters rather had the effect of preventing the poor joining provident medical clubs; do you agree with that?

You mean the hospital letters?

2493. Yes?

Certainly so. I think that the system of out-door relief by hospitals requires amendment in the interests of the poor themselves.

2494. You would not stop it altogether?

I would not stop it altogether; but we want more co-operation.

2495. What cases would you like the hospital out-door letters to apply to; how would you have the thing revised?

The evil of the system at present is that the letters are given by the subscribers for the most part with very little knowledge of the circumstances and condition of those that are applying for them. I am not prepared to formulate any plan at present; it is a difficult question, though I have thought about it; but if some plan could be formulated which would avoid the present improper use that is made of those letters it would be very desirable.

2496. You would give the letters to special cases, or to specially poor people?

Both. Your Lordship has indicated how the evil is done; that when they (70.)
know that by going about and begging here and there they can get a letter for
the hospital, they are not encouraged thereby to put into the provident dispens-
aries or provident medical clubs.

2497. What sort of number of people are there subscribing in your district
to the provident dispensary?
I could not say.

2498. Notwithstanding the difficulty which these charities create, you have
got a considerable number of these provident societies?
Yes.

2499. Lord Sandhurst; Do the Jews marry early as a rule.
No, not so early as the Gentiles.

2500. Then you do not think that the prospect of out-door relief from the
Jewish Board of Guardians tends to stimulate early marriages?
I have not seen any evidence of that.

2501. You said just now, I think, that the out-door relief, as administered by
the Jewish guardians, tends rather to diminish the wages?
I am not certain that it does; I have not such an intimate acquaintance
with the relief given by the Jewish Board of Guardians as to say that it does
reduce wages; I should doubt if it is sufficient for that.

2502. I wish to draw out from you an opinion as to whether the amount of
out-door relief given to Jewish poor tends to reduce the wages of, and crowd
out, the Christian poor who are not in receipt of such out-door relief?
I cannot say that it does, except so far as this, that unless there was a large
amount of relief given by the Jewish Board of Guardians these poor creatures
could not exist

2503. They exist on much less than Christians do?
Oh, dear yes.

2504. Earl of Strafford; You mentioned foreign immigration, and also, I
believe immigration from the country. During the last 12 months have there
been a good many people who have come from the country into the White-
chapel Union?
Not into the workhouse; but we have had a very large influx of people from
all parts of the country. In our parish we have a very large number of common
lodging-houses, and the best work that we do is keeping a watch upon these
common lodging-houses for the purpose of preventing people coming there and
settling down to lodging-house life. In fact, we always have members out on
this work, one night a week. Whenever we find any of these people who have
come from the country, our object is at once, if possible, to send them
back again. It is best for them, and it is best for us. If they remain in the
lodging-house, they settle down and become criminals, or casuals, or join the
ordinary begging community; and our plan is to communicate with those who
will co-operate with us in the place from which they come, and if possible, to
send them back there rather than to allow them to add to the casual population
of the Metropolis.

2505. Are these people mostly single men or married men?
I am sorry to say that they are largely married men. Unfortunately there is
no system which is trusted in the country, which gives any reliable information
with regard to the demands in the labour market, and they come up, led to
London by all sorts of expectations.

2506. Have you been tolerably successful in inducing these people to go
back to the country districts from which they have emigrated?
To the country districts and to the provincial towns. We have sent many
families back; we are sending them back every week.

2507. Through guardians?
No; that is, by private agencies.

2508. Have
2508. Have you a good many benevolent institutions in Whitechapel which
are able to undertake that kind of duty?
No; I am speaking now of the parish of Spitalfields, which is as distinct
from Whitechapel, after all, as Kensington would be from Bethnal Green. In
my own parish of Spitalfields it is done by our own parochial organisation,
irrespective, of course, of creed or any other consideration.

2509. And you have been tolerably successful in inducing these people who
come into London to go back again?
We have been successful with many of them. If there is any respectability
left in them they almost jump at the idea of being sent back whence they came
rather than gravitating down lower and lower.

2510. And are these expenses defrayed by the benevolent institutions you
have been referring to, or do the guardians help?
It is one of the mysteries where we get our money from. We are obliged to
get it, and we get it. We have no rates to fall back upon.

2511. Chairman.] Do you approve of such work being found for the unemploy-
ed as is found by the Open Spaces Association, to take an example?
I should not disapprove of it altogether, if the greatest care was taken in the
selection of those who were put to work, and if the greatest care was taken to
utilise the opportunity and to put them in the position of earning their own
livelihood afterwards, so that they might not be in the ranks of the unemployed
at the same time next year.

2512. Is there not a danger that you may encourage the want of providence
on the part of the considerable classes of labourers who obtain high wages
during six or nine months of the year, and then, having laid by nothing, come
upon charity or the rates in the winter?
There is not only a danger, but it has had that effect, there is not the
slightest doubt; and that is why I guard my answer as to the desirability of
these works.

2513. But is it possible to guard the works against that danger?
I think that it might be, by a very careful supervision of the cases that come.
I would only take on those men whom there seemed to be some possibility and
probability of organising up for the future.

2514. You said that you would desire greater uniformity in the metropolitan
unions in the administration of the Poor Law; what change would you recom-
 mend in the present regulations for such a purpose as that?
I will take two such unions as Whitechapel and Poplar. In the case of
Whitechapel we are extremely careful with reference to out-door relief; and then in
Poplar, out-door relief is very lavishly given, and pauperism is consequently
enormously on the increase there.

2515. What new regulation would you make in order to put a stop to that?
I should like to see some regulation made by the Local Government Board,
so that, for instance, when there was any excess in the number of recipients of
out-door relief, over those we will say, who are inmates of the workhouse, there
should be at once an investigation made as to the cause of it.

2516. But when the investigation showed, as for example it would in the
case of Poplar, that by the last Return there were 11 to every 1,000 of the
population receiving out-door relief, whilst in Whitechapel there were only 1-3,
what steps then should the Local Government Board take, in your opinion?
I think the course that the Local Government Board then should take would
be to override the authority of the guardians in administering this lavish out-
door relief, and by some order of the Local Government Board prevent this
worse than waste.

2517. That seems to be rather dealing with the special case; have you made
up your mind as to any general regulation which could be enforced in order to
(70.)
alter the system in parishes where you consider that the law is not well administered?

No; the only thing I could conceive would be such an inquiry by those very experienced officers of the Local Government Board, who would be able to advise the Board presently as to what regulations would be necessary in order to avoid this extravagance; I could not say more, because it is a very wide question.

2518. Lord Sandhurst.] In regard to the immigration from the provinces of which we have heard, do you think that that immigration is increasing?

Not at the present time. It was larger this winter than in previous winters. For the last five years it has increased considerably each winter.

2519. Were these people who came in mostly agricultural labourers?

About half and half we have had. I should think about 50 per cent. of those who came in during the last winter were agricultural labourers; the other half were from the provincial towns.

2520. Earl of Milltown.] Is there any feeling of animosity towards the foreign immigrants amongst the native population?

Yes.

2521. Is that increasing?

Yes.

2522. Is it likely to become a dangerous element?

Well, I should hope not.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Rev. BROOKE LAMBERT, having been called in; is Examined, as follows.

2523. You are Vicar of Greenwich?

Yes.

2524. And a member of the board of guardians?

Yes.

2525. Have you been for some time a member of the board?

I have been a member for seven years. I was on the Whitechapel Board of Guardians years ago, so that I have had some experience of boards of guardians.

2526. Now, I observe that the amount of pauperism in Greenwich, as shown by the latest Return which we have from the Poor Law Board, is very high. The figures are these: the ratio per thousand of the in-door paupers in Greenwich, by this Return which was taken on the 1st of January 1888, and the 1st of July 1887, was 16·9; the average of London being 13·3; and the ratio per thousand of the population of the out-door paupers is no less than 25·7 in Greenwich, the average in London being 10·9; and the total average of the whole to the thousand in the population in Greenwich is 42·6, the average in London being 24·2. Can you tell us whether this large amount of pauperism in Greenwich is a new feature or whether it has been for some time in that specially pauperised condition?

I am sorry that I am not good at statistics, and I have not the statistics of many years; but as regards the last three years, it has been a steadily increasing proportion. If one takes the number in the largest week in 1886, it was 5,141; in 1887 it was 4,249.

2527. Are those the out-door and in-door combined?

No; I beg pardon; the in-door remains practically the same; it will be a little bit more. I am taking the out-door, and it was 3,608 in 1866.

2528. But
2528. But from your observation as a guardian, without giving us precise statistics, can you tell us whether there has been recently any considerable increase in pauperism, or whether this large amount of pauperism relatively to the rest of London has been existing for some time?

Relatively to the rest of London I could not say. What I do find in Greenwich is that there is growing up a distinctly large pauper class, which I fear very much in the future.

2529. And can you attribute that to any special cause?

I attribute it, in the first place, to the fact that the large works in our neighbourhood have ceased to employ hands in the same way as they did before; that such labour as there is now is labour which comes on in a great rush, and provides large wages for unskilled people; and that the conditions of relief by the Poor Law and general charity are such as to keep in a place where labour is under these bad conditions a large number of people who have been thrown out of work. They are becoming more and more pauperised.

2530. Can you explain the system upon which your Board proceed; they appear to give out-door relief very largely; can you tell us the system?

I think they give it tolerably strictly on the principles of the Poor Law. That is to say, a widow very seldom gets permanent out-door relief till she is over 60 years of age; she gets pretty heavy relief when she first becomes a widow. A man would not get out-door relief if he were able-bodied; we do not break the law in that way, but if he has any sickness he gets it pretty freely; but, of course, if drunkenness were found in either of those cases the relief would be stopped. But there is no discrimination; anybody gets it, whatever his past has been; and there is very little application of the house test. The guardians have always refused to lay down any regulations prescribing the sort of relief that a man ought to have according to his position. They say they can have no hard-and-fast line, but must judge each case according to its merits, which means that they will not lay down any regulations at all.

2531. Can you tell us why the guardians have an objection to applying the house test?

I think it is partly general kindness, partly general stupidity; generally from a sort of feeling that it is cheaper to give out-door relief. When I have suggested that a sterner test would be better, the remark I have often heard made is, "But it is much cheaper to give out-door relief than to take this large family into the house."

2532. Taking those objections in their order, as a matter of kindness have your guardians considered whether the effect on the labouring population is really one which can be said to be kindness if the result, as seen from these figures, has been to cause a very large amount of pauperism in Greenwich, compared with other parts of London?

I have never been able to make them take that view at all; I do not think that guardians, where out-door relief is given, ever take the case of the class into consideration; they are thinking of the individual.

2533. Now you said that the impression upon your Board was, that it was cheaper to give this large amount of out-door relief?

Yes.

2534. Looking at the number of paupers in Greenwich, do you think that cheapness has been attained?

No, I do not at all; but I wish I could get someone to drive the facts into their heads.

2535. I gather that your own opinion, individually, would be, that a more strict administration of the law would be beneficial in Greenwich?

Exceedingly beneficial. I should wish to make a qualification afterwards. My own view is that the house test ought to be most strictly administered, but (70.)
that, concurrent with that, adequate out-door relief ought to be given. I consider that the present system is the most cruel that you can possibly have.

2536. Will you explain what you mean by adequate out-door relief?

At the present moment a widow gets 2s. 6d. Nobody supposes she can live on that 2s. 6d. What must she do to supplement the 2s. 6d.? She takes work; and, of course, she can take work as a charwoman or needlewoman on better terms than the woman who has to pay that 2s. 6d. out of her earnings; but what she gets from charing or needlework is not enough, and so she gets the rest by some sort of begging or another; not bad begging, but private charity. There is this poor woman never really knowing how she is to live for the morrow, and being supposed to be taken care of either by the person who employs her, or by the Poor Law, or by private charity.

2537. Would you agree with me in the opinion that a great deal of such out-door relief is simply out-door relief in aid of insufficient wages?

I am quite certain of that.

2538. And is not the certain result of such a system to lower the rate of wages in the district?

Yes. I have often wished for statistics to prove it; but it must be so.

2539. Have you a labour yard in Greenwich?

We have, indeed.

2540. Could you tell us your opinion of the working of that yard?

Have you had a guardian of St. Pancras before you? I believe there is a guardian of St. Pancras, Mr. Allen, who did make a labour yard do some good. The working of the labour yard in the majority of instances is wholly and entirely bad. The man looks to get the wages at the end of the day instead of having to wait till the end of the week. That is one great attraction of the labour yard to the badly off. Take a labour yard like ours. We have had this year as many as 400 in it. I think the last week there were 260. These are the returns of one of our worst weeks: 405 on Saturday, 360 on Monday, 316 on Tuesday, and 353 on Wednesday; and only two men to supervise those. The men practically can do as little as they like. There are some good fellows in the labour yard who break their ton of stone, and do their work honestly; but the rest (I am speaking not my own theories, but from statements of the officers who watch over them) do just as much or as little as they like.

2541. Now if you were to offer all these men the workhouse, for how many have you accommodation at the present time?

I persuaded the guardians to make calculations about it, and we thought that we should have room; they did not intend to stop the labour in our yard entirely.

2542. Supposing that the labour yard was to be stopped, what amount of accommodation could you have provided for men who had been offered the house?

Only 25 per cent. at the time. We made out that we could make up about 100 more beds in the house; and we were thinking of taking down another outside house in order to accommodate them.

2543. And you would have been glad to see that experiment tried?

I should have been most glad to see that experiment tried. For two reasons: First because, taking these 400 men (I am speaking now not in theory, but on the evidence of the relieving officer), 200 men at least of these 400 men would obviously and certainly not have come in. He has stated to the Board again and again that there were 200 men in the labour-yard who, if it were open all the year round, would always be in it. So that, without being the least unmerciful, you know that these fellows are just cadging about, and they take the labour yard, for it is a very convenient way of doing very little and earning
earning a regular wage. Then as regards another 100 of the 400, I am sure they would have got on; I think that our 100 beds would practically have been enough.

2544. And, practically, though it would have been severe at first, if the system had been persevered in the number of applicants would have diminished another year?

I do not know what will be our next year's numbers, because of what has been done this year at Greenwich.

2545. Speaking of Greenwich alone at this moment, would you be in favour of the Local Government Board prohibiting a labour yard in Greenwich?

I was thinking how I should answer; well, I should say I should be in favour of their prohibiting it; immediately and once, without making other arrangements; yes, if they required adequate relief to be given in all out-door cases.

2546. Subject to certain other arrangements, you think such a measure might be a salutary one?

I am sure it would be an utterly wholesome one. I beg you to notice these figures, 300, 315, and 353, and two men to look after them. And stone breaking is the worst of all tests, because it is terrible cruelty to one man to have to break three-quarters of a ton of stone, and another man can do it as easily as possible; and there is no supervision; it is the most demoralising system of relief you can have.

2547. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Then can you suggest any other system?

We ought to have, and that our guardians see now, a labour house, a real workhouse. We have not got room enough. We do get work out of the able-bodied men who come into our house, where we have them under supervision, and can make them do their work.

2548. Chairman.] What sort of work would you make them do if you had one?

Well, I should take as my model the labour workhouse at Grove-road, the Whitechapel labour workhouse, where they have got a good master, and they find no difficulty in employing the men in all sorts of various labour. They do corn-grinding and coffee-grinding; they make boxes out of old meat-tins. It requires a very experienced manager to do it.

2549. Now, comparing your experience in Whitechapel with the experience you have had in Greenwich, do you think that the Whitechapel system is much preferable, both for the sake of the poor and of the rates; when you were in Whitechapel what was the condition then of the administration of the Poor Law; was it strict or lax?

It was administered on very lax principles.

2550. And was the result much the same as at Greenwich?

I consider very much the same. We had the same rioting, of which we have had signs at Greenwich, threatening to wreck the bakers' shops, and that sort of thing.

2551. And do you think that it might fairly be expected that if the system which is now in force in Whitechapel were gradually and prudently introduced into Greenwich the same results would follow?

I am certain the same results would follow if you have either adequate out-door relief from the Poor Law or private charity to meet it. May I explain that my difficulty in going in for a stringent rule is that in the Tower Hamlets division, where they have abolished out-door relief, they are obliged to raise 700 l. a year to pay pensions, and if it had not been for Mr. Crowder they would not have been able to carry on. He has advanced the money again and again, and in Stepney, one district of it, they spend 1,300 l., 740 l. of which goes in pensions. Therefore, you must have an immense deal of private charity ready to work with the Poor Law or else you would get great suffering.

(70.)  N N 3  2552. Therefore,
2552. Therefore, your opinion is that, unless you can supplement the administration of the Poor Law by such charitable associations as exist in St. George's-in-the-East and Whitechapel, you could not work it?

I believe it would work, but I think there would be very great hardship, such hardship as to create a reason, which would bring about the very evils we were seeking to remedy. I think the poor would get on.

2553. But you think it essential, for the satisfactory working of a system of that kind, to supplement it by a charitable organisation working in conjunction with the Poor Law authorities; is that your opinion?

That is my opinion; my idea being, of course, that the Poor Law and private charity should always take separate spheres.

2554. Would you not be in favour of their working, to a great extent, in conjunction, as they do now in St. George's-in-the-East; by which I mean that the guardians refer cases that they do not consider to come within their rules to these charitable organisations, so that the two organisations work in that sense together?

I would have every first application sent to private people. I think if you could keep the first application off the Poor Law, you would stop pauperism at the onset in many cases.

2555. Have you any experience of your casual ward in Greenwich?

Not personal experience of it.

2556. Earl of Aberdeen.] Would you say that the ratio of pauperism per 1,000 of the population would correspond to the amount of out-door relief; in other words, would you expect to find that where out-door relief is large, the ratio per 1,000 of the population of pauperism is correspondingly large?

I should certainly expect to find that.

2557. There are exceptional reasons, are there not, at Greenwich just now which contribute to the large proportion of out-door relief, as regards accommodation in the workhouse?

No. The infirmary is too small; we have not enough room; but I do not think that out-door relief has been given, because we have not accommodation in the house.

2558. Is the workhouse nearly full?

Yes, it is always over its numbers.

2559. Then, supposing you were to reduce the out-door relief and to offer the workhouse test, how would you be able to meet the requirements?

We are building. It is over its number, because the Poor Law Board, or the Local Government Board, induced us to build some new buildings, and then did not give us the accommodation that we expected; and so we are building a new infirmary, and we shall have plenty of room.

2560. Has there been any endeavour to make the ratepayers realise the advantage of restricting out-door relief on the ground of economy, or for any other reason?

No; except so far as one tries to influence them; not otherwise.

2561. Is it a matter of economy; I mean if there was less out-door relief and more in-door relief, would the rates be less?

I am certain the rates would be less. That is not my point at all. I would spend much more on the poor, if the demoralisation was not so great.

2562. I merely put the question with reference to influencing the ratepayers, and making the out-door relief less popular?

I should not care to appeal to that motive at all; but there is no doubt about it, that if you take the statistics of Stepney or Whitechapel, the relief to the rates is enormous.

2563. How
2563. How is it that the system of out-door relief is popular with the main body of the ratepayers in Greenwich?
On account of the general stupidity of humanity.

2564. It is not from any idea of a benefit to be gained, for instance, by a reduction of wages?
They cannot see so far as that. There is no doubt that they do benefit, and here and there the landlord gets his rent paid; but that does not influence it.

2565. Perhaps it is a general idea that it is hard upon the poor not to grant out-door relief?
That is the idea, that it is hard upon the poor.

2566. Earl of Strafford.] Was it in Greenwich or Woolwich that Mr. Montagu Williams this winter gave a large amount in charity?
In Greenwich.

2567. Was it a large sum?
About 470l.

2568. Was it judiciously administered, do you think, and were inquiries made as to the nature of the claims of the recipients; because, in answer to a question, we had evidence given by a previous witness, saying that it had not done much good; is that your opinion?
What evil it may have laid up in store for next winter I do not dare to say; but it was distributed in the most reckless wholesale way. I suppose he made some inquiries; but all I can say is that I sent to him six cases, and said that each case wanted 1l. a-piece, and six weeks afterwards those cases had not been relieved. I forget whether they did get anything from him; but his plan was to give 5s. and a coal-ticket; and I know one man in my parish who deserted his wife and family, who went and represented himself as a bachelor and got his coal-ticket and bread and this 5s. relief, or whatever it was.

2569. But the amount altogether was not much more than 500l.?
I should not like to be quoted for that statement; my memory is not good for figures. My impression is that was the first publication. Then my impression is that he made a second appeal; it could not have been over the 1,000l. altogether, I think.

2570. But I gather from what you said that you disapprove of it altogether?
It was a most wicked thing.

2571. And you hope it will not be repeated next winter?
No; in the interests of the poor, the wives and the families. It just kills the heart of everybody striving to live to see these fellows getting relief in that way.

2572. Earl Spencer.] Is there any charitable organisation for relief in Greenwich?
There is the Charity Organisation Society; and I hope one's charity in one's own parish is organised to a certain extent.

2573. I rather gathered from what you said that you thought it would be impossible to put down out-door relief to any great extent, unless you had something like what they have at the Tower Hamlets?
Yes.

2574. Would there be any difficulty in getting the same thing up in your parish?
I think I should have a great difficulty in finding a man who would make himself responsible. I think we should get the money in the long run; but I should be a little afraid that it would be very difficult at first.

(70.)

2575. Does
2575. Does not the Charity Organisation Society now work alongside of the Poor Law in many cases?
Yes; but in my own district I have always tried to keep the Charity Organisation Society to its strict principles; to organise charity, not to relieve. Practically we do not relieve at all; we get relief for others, but do not ourselves relieve.

2576. Have you many medical provident societies?
Yes, we have had a very great success. I tried to make a permanent dispensary there, which gave relief letters abroad into a provident one, but we have abandoned that, and we have built a provident dispensary, and within less than two years we have got 2,000 members.

2577. Were those cases formerly relieved by the Poor Law?
By the Poor Law and private charity.

2578. Do you consider that the administration of medical out-door relief in the union as improvident as the other relief that you have spoken of?
I think it is very freely given; but I am afraid I could hardly pronounce an opinion on the subject. It seems to me that sickness is a thing you must help, and therefore I have not turned my attention quite to whether one could diminish it at all.

2579. You have not discovered any abuse from medical extras, alcohol, and that sort of thing, being given away too freely?
No. I think that the medical officers are very much afraid of appearing to increase the rates. I do not think they are as liberal, myself, as they ought to be in nourishment, in my view of the Poor Law undertaking any case entirely. You see that the present thing is that the Poor Law just gives a little and says it is relieving the case; whereas it is only touching the fringe of it.

2580. You would be always in favour of giving full relief, where it is given?
Where it is given. There must be some qualification to that remark. The result of that would not be, in the long run, that there would be so much relief given. You find that wherever people give in small sums, they will throw the sums away. Make the sum a large sum, and they will give it carefully; and therefore the compelling of adequate relief would compel adequate investigation. It is extraordinary that every widow comes up and gets her half-crown; but make it 4 s., and hardly any widows would get the 4 s.; they would think a great deal before they would give that; and if you were once to compel on an ordinary scale, take the lowest you like, adequate relief in each case, you would knock out-door relief on the head.

2581. Then I rather gather from you that you consider the investigation of cases in Greenwich not sufficiently carried out?
Not sufficiently carried out.

2582. Has there been much improvement in the infirmary accommodation in the workhouse?
The infirmary accommodation is as good, I think, as could be.

2583. Do you have trained and paid nurses, or pauper nurses?
We have not pauper nurses; we have nurses, but there is not a supply of trained nurses; we try and get them trained, but we are obliged to take them in the lower positions from where we can get them, and make the best use of them we can.

2584. You are within the district which gets payment from the common fund of the metropolis?
Yes.

2585. Earl of Milltown.] I understand you to say that you are not
in favour of the house test without its being accompanied with out-door relief?

Concurrently with an order from the Poor Law Board that every case relieved by out-door relief should be adequately relieved on a scale then specified.

2586. That was what you meant when you said just now that you were in favour of it with altered and improved out-door relief?

Yes, precisely.

2587. I suppose the chief reason that the ratepayers are in favour of giving so much out-door relief is that they think it is cheaper?

I think so.

2588. If that is so, why did you say just now that you thought it would be wrong to demonstrate to them that it is much dearer?

Personally, I do not care to appeal on grave questions like that to people on the pounds, shillings, and pence grounds. It seems to me you have got a much stronger ground to go upon in the demoralisation which you can show to them to result.

2589. If your object is to do away with the system as a bad one, the stronger the argument the better?

But if I bring this argument forward they say, "We know that all those people have gone out of the parish in which the rates are reduced," whereas Mr. Vallance, the clerk of the Whitechapel Board, will tell you, if you see him, that he has more removal orders into his parish than out of it.

2590. Are you an elected guardian?

I am an elected guardian now; I was a nominated guardian in Whitechapel.

2591. Chairman.] You spoke of adequate relief being enforced; would you explain how you deal with a particular case. Supposing a widow applies, and that she has four children, and that she shows that she earns 3s. a week, and could not earn any more, how would you deal with that case; what would be the course you would take?

I think that no adult living alone ought to have less than 3s. 6d. a week; I think she ought to have 6d. a week for each of her children up to four years of age; 1s. for each child from four to 12; 1s. 6d. from 12 to 14.

2592. You would give her sufficient relief to maintain her children?

Yes, on that scale. I should deduct the 3s. which you ascertain she has got.

2593. Lord Balfour of Burley.] And if in spite of that she begged, would you inflict any penalty?

No; I would take them into the house if they begged.

2594. Would you allow those to whom you gave relief to do any work at home?

On a perfect Poor Law system, I certainly should not.

2595. Chairman.] I hardly think that you could have understood my question. My question was: supposing a widow earned 3s. a week, and did labour at home, what would you do? You said, in answer, that you would give her relief?

Because I was speaking of the present system in which you have not got the Poor Law to do what it ought to do eventually. In the long run I hope to see the Poor Law only relieving in the house, and not giving any out-door relief at all but as a temporary measure. But if you were to attempt to start it now-a-days the conscience of the country would not stand it, and we should have a reaction, and we should get to worse than we have got at present.

2596. Lord Balfour of Burley.] While you regard that idea of giving adequate as desirable thing in the abstract, you recognise that it is impossible to get people in the present state of circumstances to consent to it?

(70.)
In my personal judgment the conscience of the country is not prepared for it yet.

2597. Chairman.] I do not think you mean that the conscience of the country is not prepared for adequate relief; what you mean is that the conscience of the country is not prepared for stopping all out-door relief?

Yes.

2598. Now what is your opinion as to another thing. We were told to-day of some unions not giving a widow in a case such I have supposed any relief, but requiring her if she wants any assistance to let her children be taken to the district school and there maintained; what do you say to that?

I very much approve of that; in fact, I was thinking. I should correct my evidence just now to say that I did not think the case ought to arise. I do not think, of course, that you should take the whole of the children to the school, but only take two, say, and then she would require to support the other two.

2599. I assumed in my question that the widow was only able to support herself; but a case might arise where she supported herself and one child; and in that case I understand you would approve of the other children being taken to a district school, and supported there out of the rates?

Yes.

2600. Now take another case to test your view of adequate relief. I will suppose the case of a man who is partly infirm, but still able to do a certain amount of work, and on investigation it is found he can do as much as will produce him 10s. a week, and he has a wife and several children, and it is quite obvious after investigation that he cannot subsist in London upon that 10s. a week; what course would you suggest in that case?

I think even the Greenwich Guardians would refuse to give him anything; if he can do work, he is an able-bodied man; he can get 10s. a week.

2601. I suppose I am right in assuming that at Greenwich a man cannot support a wife and seven small children upon 10s. a week?

There is no doubt that even in Greenwich he would not get any relief.

2602. I will not put it as high as 10s. I will suppose that he earns 7s.; I will assume that he is a man who can earn 7s. a week, and does earn it, but that that 7s. is obviously not sufficient to support a wife and seven children; he makes application for assistance; what course would you pursue?

In the present state of things, I should offer that man the house; and even our Poor Law guardians would not give that man out-door relief, because he is earning so much.

2603. In those cases you would not advocate out-door relief out of the house?

No; but I should think a case like that, if the man were provident, is one that private charity should take up; if he were improvident I should offer the house.

2604. Earl of Aberdeen.] You remember my question about the ratio of pauperism in cases where there was very little out-door relief; you said that the ratios would correspond?

Yes.

2605. Would you be surprised to find these figures:—In St. George's-in-the-East, there is very little out-door relief, namely, only 5 per 1,000, yet in Bethnal Green, where there is a much higher ratio of out-door relief the total gives a smaller ratio per 1,000 than in the case of St. George's-in-the-East?

That is to say, there is more out relief in Bethnal Green, and yet less pauperism?

2606. Less pauperism on the whole?
I am so astonished at it that I should like very much to have the figures; I certainly will make inquiry; it is very curious.

2607. There must have been some exceptional circumstances?
There must have been some very extraordinary cases. Before I go, I should like to say that I have now found that the amount which Mr. Montagu Williams expended was 1,400 l.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday, 4th June, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Lunæ, 4o Junii, 1888.
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THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, K.G., IN THE CHAIR.

MR. FRANCIS PEEK, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

2608. [Earl of Aberdeen.] I BELIEVE you for a long time have been much interested in the condition of the poor?

Yes, with regard to the very lowest class of the poor and the paupers, I have taken for 30 years a great interest in their condition.

2609. Did you take an active part in the work of the Mansion House Council on Metropolitan Poverty during the winter of 1886-87?

Yes; I was, I think, the principal means of getting the Lord Mayor to summon that council, and I was also constantly at work on the committee that was elected by the council to examine into the condition of the poor of the metropolis.

2610. Can you tell us briefly what were the objects of that council?

In 1885-86 there had been a Mansion House Relief Fund, which had resulted from the rioting on account of supposed destitution; everyone who had any work amongst the poor felt that an immense deal of harm had been done by that fund; and from information I received from different quarters I knew that there were preparations going on to have still further demonstrations, and to try and get another large fund for the benefit of these undeserving classes; so I wrote to "The Times," and also went to the Lord Mayor and asked him to summon a council thoroughly to examine into the condition of the poor, and if it was found really that there was such destitution that a special fund was needed, to make preparations in good time, so that the fund should not be wasted.

2611. Could you state who were the leading members of the council?

They were practically all the leading men who took an interest in this question in London. I think there were about 36 of them. Unfortunately I have forgotten to bring a list of the council; but of the committee, Mr. Pell (whom I think you have had before you here) was the chairman, and a Mr. Crowder and a Dr. Longstaff were on it, all men connected with boards of guardians, and also with the Charity Organization Society.

2612. What steps were taken to carry out the objects which the council had in view?

We met twice a week, and we issued about 10,000 printed circulars to every class of persons whom we thought likely to be able to tell us anything about the condition of the poor, such as poor law guardians, relief officers, pawn-brokers, lodging-house keepers, in fact, every one that we thought would be able to give any reliable information about the condition of the poor. I think we

(70.)

sent
sent out about 10,000 printed circulars, and on getting them back we analysed, and made a summary of their replies.

2613. Lord Thring. How many were returned?
I think about one-third; I am speaking, of course, quite offhand.

2614. Earl of Aberdeen. Did you come to the conclusion that any special fund was likely to be required?
No; the concensus of opinion seemed to be that if the already existing agencies were strengthened there would be no need for any special fund, except there was a long period of frost, and then undoubtedly there would be need. That frost did not happen, so there was no need.

2615. In the course of the inquiry, I suppose you had an opportunity of observing the general operation of the Poor Law?
Yes.

2616. Will you tell us what conclusion you came to about it?
The conclusion I came to was that the administration of the Poor Law, so far as London was concerned, was an entire failure, and that it must, as at present administered, always fail under circumstances of extreme want of work, or extreme stress of weather.

2617. Would you state what, in your view, are the primary purposes for which the Poor Law exists?
First of all, the relief of destitution. My conception of the Poor Law is that it was partly founded from humanity, and partly for self-preservation of society; for humanity, because the community would not endure that any large number of persons should die or suffer extreme destitution; but equally from self-preservation, because it has been always found that, unless the community know and feel that absolute destitution is relieved by law, they will give indiscriminately large alms, and thereby dangerously increase the mendicant class.

2618. In what respects do you think especially there has been a failure in the administration of the Poor Law?
During the extreme stress of weather there was undoubtedly a great deal of destitution that was not relieved by the guardians. Many boards of guardians made the conditions of relief so hard that the poor would rather endure extreme suffering and destitution than apply for their legal relief; but the principal evidence (and I think it is a conclusive evidence) of the failure of the administration of the Poor Law in London, is that not only did mendicancy very much increase during this time, but the very guardians of the peace, the police officers, whose duty it was to take into custody all who solicited alms, that is, all mendicants, so sympathised with the utter distrust on the part of the public of the administration of the Poor Law, that I myself have seen, and I suppose most of the Committee have seen, large bodies of men, mendicants, walking about the streets of London accompanied by police, not to do their duty and take them into custody, but to give them their sanction. Therefore, it is evident that either the police were dreadfully wanting in their duty, or else the Poor Law Guardians, whose duty it was to have relieved these men going about with banners, saying they had no work, had not done their duty in relieving them.

2619. Have you any proof of that failure on the part of the guardians?
Simply the marching about of these bodies of mendicants, when it was the duty of the police to take them into custody. According to law, these men, if they were destitute, had a proper right to apply to the guardians; and all mendicants can be taken into custody, but the police were actually sanctioning this mendicancy.

2620. Lord Balfour of Burley. Do you know whether those men had applied to the guardians?
I do not know at all; they ought to have applied. I am simply speaking now as to the distrust of the public with regard to the carrying out efficiently of the law. If the public knew that the guardians were doing their duty and relieving destitution, they would not tolerate this mendicancy, and above all, they would not tolerate the police sanctioning it.

2621. Earl
2621. Earl of Aberdeen.] As regards the administration of the Poor Law, do you apply your remarks to the metropolis generally?

No. As far as I could see in studying their returns, the great fault is the want of uniformity. Some boards of guardians, it seems to me, must have relieved lavishly; others have done their duty properly; and others have not done their duty at all.

2622. The want of uniformity seems to you the chief defect?

That seems to me the chief defect.

2623. Could you give examples of the manner in which you think injustice results from the present system?

It must be cruelly unjust that a man should receive only 2 s. 4 d. a week in Rotherhithe, whereas another man, exactly in the same position, would be allowed 5 s. 6 d. in Battersea.

2624. Is that in labour yards?

In labour yards probably; I am not quite certain.

2625. For work?

For work, presumably; but there, again, is a want of uniformity, for many Boards do not exact work at all, whereas others do.

2626. What recommendations have you to suggest as a remedy for this state of things?

My recommendation would be this: that, first of all, under the Poor Law Board there should be a gathering of all the most experienced guardians of the poor in London, and that they should fix a fair amount of relief to be given, and also the proper amount of labour, and a proper way of giving this labour, and that that should be made uniform throughout the metropolis; and then the public should be thoroughly advised that this was the case, and therefore there was no excuse whatever for anybody saying he was destitute.

2627. Speaking generally, would you be in favour of enlarging the facilities for obtaining poor relief?

No; I do not think that is possible with any wisdom. Destitution must be the test, and can be the only wise test for relief.

2628. As regards the scale on which relief should be granted, have you any suggestion to make?

No, because I think that ought to be left to those who are experienced as guardians; it is for those who have had so much more experience than I have personally, to fix it.

2629. You alluded just now to labour yards; we have had evidence tending to show that those labour yards generally are not considered satisfactory; what is your opinion upon that point?

Personally, I cannot see myself why they cannot be made satisfactory, but all our most experienced guardians are opposed to them, and I should not think of putting my opinion against theirs.

2630. Then, on another point, do you consider that sufficient discrimination is generally used with regard to the applicants for relief?

Personally, I do not. I think that while destitution is the only test for relief, men of good character, the exceptional applicants, when their character has been examined into, ought to have some different labour or some different treatment from the ordinary pauper.

2631. But do you think that it is possible to carry out that in practice?

I think so, myself; I can only judge by my own action in relieving. A very small proportion of those who apply, even during stress of weather, are really deserving characters, I should think certainly not one-twentieth; and I do not see why, by proper arrangement beforehand, the vestry might not afford relief almost in their own line of work to men of such character.

2632. Is there any practical intercommunication between vestry authorities and the guardians?

(79.)
My impression is, but I may be wrong, that there are still some select vestries which combine the two, the relief of the poor with vestry work; but still inasmuch as both vestries and guardians represent the ratepayers, and are paid by them, it seems to me that there could be no great difficulty in their working, and that they ought to work one with another.

2633. Then, again, as to co-operation between the Poor Law authorities and charitable agencies, have you any experience upon that, so far as it has yet gone?

Yes, I have founded and worked two charity organization committees in my own neighbourhood; and I have watched with very great care the central organization.

2634. What is your opinion of the work done by these societies?

I think they have done very good work in the past in supplementing the deficiency of the Poor Law, but I think that a great deal of their work is wrong, that it is simply trying to do badly what the Poor Law Guardians ought to do well, that is to say, to relieve destitution.

2635. Which part of London are you referring to in connection with that point?

Sydenham, Lewisham, and Norwood.

2636. Are we to understand that you disapprove of the whole system under which those societies are worked, or of any particular mode in which their work is carried on?

I simply disapprove of that portion of their work which relieves destitution, which I look upon as the absolute duty of the guardians of the poor. There is an immense work for them to do amongst those who are above destitution, which the Poor Law cannot touch, and which would be far more efficiently performed if the attention of the Charity Organization Societies was not diverted to the work of supplying those who are destitute, which does not belong to them. There are the sick; there are the deaf and dumb; there are those who are in danger of falling into destitution, and there is endless calls for charity beyond destitution.

2637. I believe you have some practicable experience of the results of a strict administration upon this question of mendicancy in your own district, have you not?

Yes, with regard to one of the societies which was founded about 15 years ago at that time, it being in the neighbourhood of the Crystal Palace, the whole neighbourhood swarmed with beggars; I myself was once accosted, I think, fifteen times in half-a-mile, and in the neighbourhood there were nests of impostors. When I succeeded in getting up this Charity Organization Society we first of all appointed a very efficient officer, and within 12 months every beggar had disappeared, and all the nests of impostors had been rooted out; and so efficiently was it worked, that during a great stress of weather (I think we had seven weeks of frost the following year) we were giving away 15{l}. a week in relief, and a fortnight after it ended we were only giving away 5s., so that we got them well in hand.

2638. But now, do you think that bond fide working people who happened to be in distress were unwilling to come forward and apply for assistance, or were they not aware of the administration of charity?

I think we relieved all the real distress; the impostors were cleared out. Of course we acted with the police.

2639. I should like to ask you whether you think it practicable to alter the actual administration of the Poor Law; that if you once saw a man professing to be in want through no fault of his own, he might be dealt with without any risk of his falling into real suffering?

I think the very existence of a beggar in the street is a disgrace either to the police or the Poor Law. The duty of the Poor Law is to relieve destitution; the duty of the police is to take up the mendicants.

2640. Then
2640. Then your opinion is, that if the public were convinced that the administration on both hands was satisfactorily carried out, they would have no scruple in abstaining from giving promiscuous relief?
A great many ladies will give under any circumstances, but it would not be so bad as it is now, and the fear of being put in prison would probably deter impostors.

2641. It is not only ladies, I suppose, who give promiscuous relief?:
Perhaps there are ladies of both sexes.

2642. I believe you have paid a great deal of attention to the system of boarding out pauper children?
Yes.

2643. Have you any remarks to offer upon that subject?
Provided that there is proper oversight, I am quite convinced that there is no system like the boarding-out system. Bringing up children in workhouses is simply cruel. In the large district schools, as at present administered for boys, perhaps it is not bad. In cottage homes, on the Mettray system, it is still better. But all of them miss two great advantages of the boarding out; that is, first of all, the complete separation from every pauper association; and next, that where the children go away young to be boarded out, almost invariably a tie is formed between the foster-parent and the child, which lasts afterwards, so that the child feels it has a home, and it is a restraint to keep it from going wrong. The tie is very real indeed among them. And then there is this great harm in all the other systems, that there is a perpetual flowing through and current of casual pauper children, in fact, it is one of the arguments used by the Poor Law officials for keeping the orphan children in the large schools, that they tend to leaven the casuals. But this seems to me very cruel, because just as they leave for good the casuals, it is almost certain that the casuals will leaven them for bad.

2644. Does not your experience show you that the lower influence predominates?
I do not think I can give any statistics; I can only argue from our own children; we should not like to put them with the children of outcasts, of gipsies, and the very lowest classes; because, though they might benefit the lower classes, it is more likely that the lower classes would degrade them.

2645. Then, as to the casual wards, are you of opinion that the present operation of the Poor Law in that respect is satisfactory?
I do not like casual wards at all. I think all these have been established only in order to make up for the workhouse not doing its work thoroughly. I do not see why there should be any casual ward at all; why should not the workhouse do its work properly?

2646. The casual wards have been abolished, you are aware, in some Metropolitan Unions?
Yes.

2647. What is your opinion generally upon the system of outdoor relief?
It may seem hard to say so, but I think the less of it the better. It seems to me that it is almost impossible to have outdoor relief to any great extent without opening the door to fraud, and pauperising a circle round those that receive relief.

2648. There must often be cases with which it is difficult to deal in any other way, such as the case of a widow and children?
Yes, the case of the widow is perhaps the most difficult of all; and for a long time I thought that they ought to receive outdoor relief; but it seems to me that they never will be relieved adequately, and that the only kind way is to take away such of their children that they cannot support themselves and put them, like boarders, in the district schools, leaving such as they can support by their own exertions, but taking care that there should be such intercourse between the parent and the children in the schools as to keep up the tie; (70.)
otherwise I think myself that giving outdoor relief to widows, though it seems kind in the first instance, is an injury to the children as well as to the parent, but especially to the children; they do not get sufficient nourishment, and they do not get sufficient care.

2649. Do you consider that there is a great deal of poverty at present, bordering on destitution?
At the present time I should doubt if there was more than usual.

2650. Do you not mean more than usual; but do you consider that there is a great deal?
There is always that; it must be so.

2651. What do you consider the chief causes of that poverty?
There are three principal causes; first, intemperance; secondly, the abominable way in which they are allowed to overcrowd the houses in the poor districts; and thirdly, the reckless production of children.

2652. Can you suggest any remedies?
Of course intemperance is a large question, but certainly a limitation of hours and a limitation of public-houses would both tend to limit it. With regard to overcrowding, I have very strong views indeed; I do not think we shall ever make any way either against sweating or the extreme poverty and misery of every sort till all houses that take in lodgers, or are let in tenements, are registered; that is to say, they should receive a certificate of the number that each house can healthily accommodate, and no more should be allowed than the certificate permits, under a very heavy penalty.

2653. Then the last cause you mentioned is perhaps the most difficult of all to deal with; the large families?
Yes, it is an excessively difficult question; but as long as the thriftless classes have families and an unlimited number of children, so long must we have poverty; and it is a question that must be faced. It cannot be right that parents should go on bringing into the world families which they are unable to support, or that the health of women should be destroyed by the rapid production of children, or that diseased parents should go on breeding diseased offspring. The whole question ought to be faced both on the physical and moral side. Until that is done we shall make very little progress towards getting rid of this dreadful class; the outcast class of society.

2654. In regard to your last answer, I presume that you are not referring to any special experiment which may have been made in other countries in the direction of trying to prevent people marrying till they could show that they were able to maintain families?
No, I look upon it that we have been shirking the subject in this country, and that the whole question is one that ought to be thoroughly examined into on every side.

2655. Lord Balfour of Burley. I understood you to commit yourself to the opinion that the administration of the Poor Law in the Metropolis had been a complete failure, and that in proof of that you pointed to the large number of people who could be seen on certain occasions wandering about the streets in the position of mendicants; I want to know how you connect that fact with your statement about the failure of the administration of the Poor Law?
Because, had destitution been relieved, it would have been first of all the duty of the police to have stopped this mendicancy; and secondly, the public, if they had been well convinced that these mendicants were being relieved by the Poor Law, would not have given to them.

2656. What do you mean by the relief of destitution; at present of course you are aware that before boards of guardians can step in, or any relieving officer can step in, the individual must apply?
Yes.

2657. Do
2657. Do you wish that altered?
No, certainly not.

2658. How do you know that these people had applied?
If they had not they ought to have been taken up; I mean that it lies between the police and the Poor Law.

2659. Forgive me for saying your theory is attractive, but is it possible to carry it into execution?
I think so; if the police were to take up every mendicant, and if it were found that all they did take up were people who ought to have applied to the Poor Law, but did not, it would soon come to an end. From personal experience, I know that in some of the boards of guardians they have made the relief so hard that one would feel, I would rather relieve this person myself than that he should undergo such a temptation.

2660. What boards of guardians do you refer to?
I would rather not mention particular boards of guardians.

2661. I do not use the words with any view of casting discredit upon your belief in the statement; but you must see that your statement will lose its value, if we cannot test its accuracy?
Then I will take the one I mentioned, Rotherhithe, where they give 2s. 4d. to an able-bodied man.

2662. What were the conditions of the man to whom that 2s. 4d. was given?
A single man.

2663. Two and fourpence a week, do you mean?
Yes, a week.

2664. Under what conditions was it given to him?
That I cannot say.

2665. Was he able-bodied?
He was able-bodied; it is under exactly the same conditions as those under which Battersea gave 5s. 6d.

2666. How do you know that they were the same conditions?
Because that is the rule, the regulation; I mean this is not an individual case; this is according to the published regulation.

2667. Without individual inquiry into the circumstances of each case, how can you say that their circumstances were the same?
Because, according to the rules of these two boards, one gives the scale of relief to a single able-bodied man as 2s. 4d., and the other as 5s. 6d.

2668. It fixes it in what way?
That is the scale of relief.

2669. Do you mean by printed regulations?
Yes.

2670. Could you put in a copy of the regulations?
No, I have not got them.

2671. You will understand that I am only asking these questions in order that we may, if the Committee thinks proper, test the exact accuracy of the information?
Yes; quite so.

2672. Chairman.] Can you give the date?
I cannot. This was all printed in the "Times" from that I got the report.

2673. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Then your knowledge of it is only arrived at from seeing a report in a newspaper?
Yes.

(70.)
2674. Have you any reason to believe that the people who wandered about the streets came in any appreciably larger proportion from Rotherhithe than from other places?

No, I cannot say that. They were all over London. That was the very difficulty. If you could only have attached these men to a certain parish, then you would have been able to say whether they were genuine or not.

2675. It comes to this; that one of your main recommendations is an extreme increase in the stringency of the laws against mendicancy and vagrancy of every kind?

That is on one side; and then on the other that the public should know that cases of real destitution were uniformly and adequately relieved throughout the Metropolis.

2676. In buildings for the purpose, such as workhouses?

Yes.

2677. Surely that comes to this; that everybody who cannot support himself from any cause will be imprisoned in one of two institutions, either in a workhouse if he goes and asks for relief, or in a prison if he does not go and ask for it?

Not necessarily, because they might have the labor test, or if not that, some similar test work room to that which there is in Birmingham.

2678. I understood you in your evidence-in-chief to condemn the labour yard?

No. I said my own feeling was strongly in favour of the labour yard, but that those experienced in the matter seemed to object to it so much that I would not put my experience against theirs.

2679. Have you ever been a guardian?

No.

2680. Then if it is the case, as I think it is, that the testimony of those who have actual administration of the Poor Law is almost unanimous, if not quite, against labour yards, surely that is a very strong point that there are inherent defects in the system which make it useless for the purpose?

There are, as you say, inherent defects in it.

2681. And I understand that you complain of the want of uniformity; at the same time you recommend that there should be a Council of Guardians in the Metropolis which should fix a definite scale of relief, of labour, and of the way of giving that labour; but surely those two things cannot be fixed for every case without inquiry into the circumstances of that individual case?

I do not myself think so. You see, destitution (that I think is universally admitted by those most competent to judge) must be the test. Then comes in the question of the family the person has; then the test, which will show that the man is really one who deserves relief, that is to say, who will work if he can.

2682. What do you regard as the proof of destitution?

A proof of destitution must be that the man has not the necessaries of life for himself and his family.

2683. But is not the one proof of destitution upon which a Poor Law authority can act, the application to that Poor Law authority; must not that be a condition precedent?

Undoubtedly.

2684. Then your recommendation comes to this: that people who are, as you say, destitute, are to be punished for not applying?

I should not say punished for not applying, but punished for applying to the public as mendicants when they ought to apply to those who are legally bound to relieve them.

2685. And
2685. And you advocate that the vestries should be empowered to give relief in the form of work?
Not exactly. My idea is this: that before every winter the vestries should arrange work that might be done in case of severe weather, such as street-sweeping and other relief of that sort, and that those who apply as destitute to the guardians, having good characters, should be sent to the vestry for them to employ.

2686. Do you mean that that should be done absolutely every winter?
That it should be prepared; I do not think it would be necessary in any but severe winters, because except in severe winters very few of really deserving people do apply; but when there comes a long frost then a great many deserving are thrown out of work, and if they be of good character I would put them to work.

2687. What sort of work do you mean?
Such as paving, such as making new roads, such as cleaning roads, or painting the workhouse, or, if they are carpenters, doing repairs to the workhouse.

2688. Is this to be done by men who are out of the workhouse or in it?
Out of it.

2689. The painting could not be done by them out of the workhouse; they would be in it for that purpose?
Yes.

2690. With regard to the paving and making new roads, what would the people ordinarily employed in paving and making new roads say to that?
I suppose a vestry, like a private individual, does not do everything that it might do ordinarily; but if there were a number of these men who would have to be relieved for nothing, or get some work, the vestry might say, “We will make this road, which is but indifferent, perfect.”

2691. Would not every bit of work of that kind given to them be practically taken away from the people usually engaged in that work?
I do not think so; I think there is what may be called a margin of work which people will not undertake, whether they are private individuals or vestries, till they are obliged. I am not speaking of absolutely repairing the main roads, but every vestry almost has a number of by-roads and side roads which everybody who drives over them knows remain year after year in a very unsatisfactory condition; those might be made perfect.

2692. Do not you think there might be some danger of the knowledge that the vestries would be prepared to give this work creating the very demand which we deplore?
They would only do it in severe weather, just to tide over a temporary distress of the deserving poor during severe weather.

2693. I did not quite follow your condemnation of the Charity Organization Society in its efforts to relieve destitution?
I did not condemn it; at least, I did not intend to condemn it, because in so doing I should condemn myself; but I say that while a Charity Organization Society, of course, relieves in various ways, a large portion of its work is in relieving destitution.

2694. Surely they make this broad distinction, that destitution, using the term in the strictest sense, should be left to the Poor Law authorities, but that in the case of anybody to whom it is the slightest use to hold out a helping hand, they are proper objects of relief from the Charity Organization Society?
Of course they vary very much in the different districts, but my impression is that that is not quite so; that they relieve destitution except it is chronic; that they most of them draw this line; they will not relieve destitution which is permanent, but if a person is destitute, and they think that in four or five weeks time he might get into work again, then they would relieve him.

(70.)
2695. But you do not condemn that, do you?
I say that it ought to be done by the Poor Law.

2696. That Poor Law is to take the trouble which individual members of the community can do through the Charity Organization Society, to endeavour to raise up those who are poor?
No. but to endeavour to relieve temporary destitution as well as permanent destitution; I think that is the duty of the Poor Law.

2697. Is it not much better that those as to whom there is some good reason for thinking that they are only temporarily destitute should be relieved by charitable agency rather than that they should come into contact with Poor Law officials, which has a degrading effect?
I do not think there is more degradation in asking for legal relief from the guardians than in asking for private charity. If I am destitute and in want of relief I have a right to it from the guardians.

2698. Do not you think that the idea that a pauper has a right to it is one of the ideas which ought to be eliminated if possible?
No. I think not. He ought, I consider, to have a right to it, but also he ought to be taught that he will only get it in return for work.

2699. Do you mean work as a test or work for wages?
Either one or the other; work for wages if you can give it him; if not, work for test.

2700. But surely there is a very great difference in principle between the two?
I do not see much difference. If I am destitute and I have a legal right to ask of the guardians to supply my destitution on condition of making a return in labour, I do not think it much matters whether that labour is given me as a test, or as work to be done. I should prefer to have it as work to be done because then it is useful.

2701. The individual would prefer it, you mean, in that way?
The individual would.

2702. But surely, putting it at its extreme, all that the destitute person can claim is the necessaries of life; whereas "wages" implies remuneration for work done?
But it does not necessarily imply that those wages should be more than sufficient to supply the necessaries of life; there is nothing in the idea of the wages that gives the idea of more than will keep the family from destitution.

2703. Surely, wages are in return for work done according to the value in the market between employer and employed. The idea of a test is not repayment for work done, but a test, as its name implies, is to see whether the person is so destitute that he will take work for a bare subsistence?
But I do not exactly myself see the difference it would make to me if I was destitute; if you gave me useful work, I should like it better; but if you made me dig a hole and fill it up again, the difference to me would be very little.

2704. I am rather glad this question has come, because I see that in your pamphlet, "The Workless, the Thirstless, and the Worthless," you say that in 1834 the Commissioners laid down the principle that the condition of relief should be that the wages given by the overseers of the poor should be below the lowest current for independent labour"; could you refer me to the passage, because I can find nothing about wages in their report?
I cannot refer you to the passage. I can tell you where I got it from: "Chambers's Encyclopaedia," on the Poor Law.

2705. Not from the original Report?
No; I could not find any original Report.

2706. Of course, we all admit that the condition of the pauper should be less eligible than that of the independent labourer, but I do not think you can find in the Poor Law Commissioners' Report any ground for the theory that the Poor
Poor Law authorities should find work for wages, as distinguished from work as a labour test?
I give the extract; it is practically an extract. I had not the original before me, but I shall be very much surprised if it should be incorrect.

2707. In the same passage you use the expression. "In 1861 the Commissioners framed the rules which now regulate Poor Law Relief." What rules do you refer to as having been promulgated in 1861?
That is all part of the same extract.

2708. I would like you to verify that, and to see whether this version of it is not the true one: That the Poor Law Commissioners ceased to exist in 1847; that the Prohibitory Order was issued in 1844, and the Out-door Relief Regulation Order in 1852. I do not know what regulations you refer to as having been promulgated in 1861, because I can find no new legislation, and I am rather anxious to find out what it is you refer to?
I will look it up, and see if there is any reference to it.

2709. Again, further down in the same passage, you go on to say that in times of exceptional distress the Local Government Board may permit guardians to employ men soliciting relief on public works. Now, I do not quite know what you refer to there?
As far as I gather, it is that they can give a permission to the guardians to open public works.

2710. But under the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order, the guardians can, without any reference to the Local Government Board, impose any labour test they think suitable?
But they could not pay wages.

2711. I do not think there is anything said about public works, using them in the form of work for wages?
I cannot point to the original; I can only point to the article upon the subject. If I understand you, the Local Government Board have no power to allow any board of guardians to employ labour, except as test; they must not pay any wages for anything they do.

2712. That is so, I think. I understand that your opinion is the contrary to that; that you think they ought to be able to do so?
That is my impression.

2713. If there was any idea of that, and it was ever carried into practice, surely the first result of that would be to increase the overcrowding, of which you so rightly condemn?
I do not see that. The first thing is that it must be strictly limited to the parish; and then the public works would not be in the parish, but probably some distance away from it.

2714. What do you mean by "in the parish"; because people will come, of course, wherever they think they can get work on easy terms?
but that would be quite contrary to my view. I would make them very hard terms.

2715. How would you enforce it?
I would have, for instance, a spade farm some little distance away, with sheds, and everyone who applied should do a full amount of work for the pay he got.

2716. But you would not do that in frosty weather?
It would be better to dig it up in frosty weather than to have no work enforced but it would not be very profitable then, of course.

2717. But would it be possible?
I do not know; it depends upon the amount of frost; but I simply spoke of that, of course, as one example. My idea is entirely that all relief should be in exchange for labour of some sort; but that if possible, and where possible, it should be wage work, but only wage given for an adequate amount of work.

(70.)

2718. How
2718. How do you distinguish then your proposal in principle from that which some men suggest in these days, that the State, either through the central Government, or the municipality, is to find work for everybody who wants it?

At the present time it must find adequate sustenance; and my only argument is that for that adequate sustenance there should be adequate labour enforced.

2719. But "adequate sustenance," taking it as it is given in the most leniently managed workhouse, is surely a long way short of the idea which has come into the minds of people, that they are to have wages provided for them?

I think there is rather a confusion either in my mind or in yours with regard to the idea of wages. You seem to think that wages must be something that, according to the current market value, is equivalent to the work done. Now, my idea of wages is simply this, that the amount is indefinite; it may be small or large, but it is something that I receive for something that I willingly do.

2720. Who is to fix it?

The guardians; and they only fix it according to the same remuneration as test work.

2721. When you say the same remuneration as test work, surely you are aware that test work is not remunerated in the ordinary sense of the word, but that it is simply given to the man, and his necessities are relieved, because he needs relief and accepts the test work; but in remunerating him we do not calculate the value of his work, but the necessity of his case, according to the number of children dependent on him?

Would you allow me to give what is in my mind? Here is an ordinary pauper who applies, and you put him to break stones, and he has got seven or eight children; you give him 10 s. a week for that; that is test work. Another man, who is of good character, is a pauper; you take him and set him to paint the workhouse; he has got the same number of children; you pay him 10 s., the same amount, but that is for labour; that is wages.

2721*. But there may be a stronger man, with two children and a wife, and a weaker man relatively, with six or eight children, but the weaker man, who perhaps does less, and is able to do less, will get a larger amount of relief?

It is simply a question of the name; in one case I call it relief after test work; in the other, wage for labour.

2722. What is the advantage in your mind of changing the name of the thing from test labour to labour for wages?

Do not you think yourself that if you were a painter and destitute, and you applied for relief, and you were put to break stones and got 10 s. a week, you would feel it very much harder than if they set you to paint the house and gave you 10 s. at the end as a reward for the labour? I mean that it would not degrade in the same way.

2723. I object to the term "reward." My feeling about it is, that if an individual comes upon the community for support, it is the community and not the individual which should dictate the way in which that support and assistance should be given; and the moment you depart from that, and entertain the idea of reward, I am unable to see any logical principle to distinguish your proposal from that of the State being bound to supply work to those who seek it; and I am endeavouring to get you to give me some standing ground:

I give it in that way. I say it is a question of not degrading while you relieve; the pauper to whom you give test-work is already, to a certain extent, degraded, and therefore he takes the amount you allow him for test-work as relief; but the man with a good character, who works at his own trade, or who gives useful work to you, though you pay him no more, inasmuch as he has given
given you an adequate remuneration, and more perhaps, for the same amount as you would give under test-work, feels no degradation, and loses no self-respect.

2724. In the same pamphlet, to which I have already made reference, you express as your opinion that "probably not 2 per cent. of the destitute are persons of good character as well as average ability in their trades"?

Yes.

2725. Then it is for the sake of this small minority that you embark in what, you will forgive me for saying, has a dangerously socialistic look about it:

For their sake, but not only for their sake but for the sake of the community also. If you only got the community to feel that the deserving poor, while strictly treated, were still being considerably treated, you would get rid of this vagrancy and mendicancy.

2726. You will not agree with me then when I say that the relief of that 2 per cent. seems to me properly the province of private charity, through the Charity Organization Societies acting in co-operation with the Poor Law authorities?

I will not say that I disagree with you, but the border-line is so near, as between the deserving in a state of destitution and those just above destitution, that it is difficult to distinguish between them.

2727. Did I understand you to say that, in your opinion, a strict administration of the Poor Law tended to mendicancy?

No, I did not say that at all, if the relief is properly given; on the contrary, I should think a strict administration of the Poor Law would tend to diminish these cases. It is the uncertain administration of the Poor Law that tends to mendicancy.

2728. I was leading up to another question upon that part of your evidence where you said that the Charity Organization Society, on which you had worked, had greatly reduced mendicancy; I was wrong, was I, in saying that it was a district where the Poor Law was strictly administered?

I cannot tell; it was in Croydon, but I do not remember now how it was administered.

2729. How long ago was that?

Fourteen years ago.

2730. How long were you connected with that Charity Organization Society?

I am still so.

2731. And are you, or have you ever been, on the Charity Organization Society's Central Council?

No; I have worked with it, but have never been on it.

2732. Chairman.] I should like to ask a question or two about wages. You spoke of giving a painter 10 1. a week, which was enough for his support, as being wages; but a painter would probably earn 3 s. a day; how could 10 s. a week be regarded as wages?

Because he is out of work.

2733. You draw a distinction between giving a man sufficient for his sustenance and giving him wages; and you instance the case of a painter who earns a great deal more than 10 s. a week; I understand you propose to give him sustenance to the extent of 10 s. a week, and then tell him it is wages; upon what ground do you suppose he will be deluded into the notion that you have given him wages?

In the severe times I take men, for example, on to work in my garden; I limit their pay to a certain amount; I say, "You can come and work at this; I do not want this work done, but rather than you should be out of work, I will pay you 10 s. a week; as soon as you can get better, go."

2734. You tell him you give him 10 s. as wages, and in point of fact you give him
him only sufficient for his actual sustenance, and you ask me to believe that this man will believe that he is receiving wages; I want to know on what grounds you expect him to believe that?

Because he is working at his trade.

2735. Then what you really mean is this, that you think it would be desirable that each man should be required to give an equivalent of work in the trade which he usually practises?

Yes, or some other that was not used as a mere test.

2736. But why should not painting be a test as well as any other labour? Because so very few can do it. Look upon the test work almost entirely as either picking of oakum or breaking of stones; I think those are the two tests.

2737. Is there any reason why test work should not be any kind of work?

No; literally speaking, certainly not; but it would make a great difference to a painter if you said, "If you want relief, you must come and break stones" (for which he is utterly incompetent), or "you may go and paint this for the same amount of relief."

2738. The points upon which I question you is calling it "wages;" they are two totally different things it seems to me. On the one question it may be argued that it is desirable to employ men in labour suitable to them, or you may argue that you may employ men upon productive labour; but the other question is whether you shall call it wages where you are only paying a man a bare subsistence; and I want to know how you can call that wages?

I should like a dictionary here to know what the word "wages" means; that is the real question.

2739. Then supposing we were to agree, if it were possible, to separate the one labour from the other, and to call one labour given to wages and the other mere relief, do you think it is the same thing for the community whether there prevails the notion that every man has a right to wages and work if he chooses, or whether a man has a right only to sustenance?

I think so long as it is known that the only remuneration, whether you call wages or whatever you call it, given by the guardians would be sufficient adequately to relieve destitution; that is the point.

2740. Then you would maintain that there is some difference, and it is not mere difference in words?

Yes, a difference in the minds of the people.

2741. You also said that you thought it desirable that the vestry should provide work in very bad weather for deserving paupers?

Yes.

2742. What is your definition of a deserving pauper?

A person who has a good character.

2743. Now, do you think that a man is a deserving pauper who has earned very large wages as a bricklayer or painter the whole of the summer, and afterwards comes upon the rates for work to do in the winter?

Decidedly undeserving.

2744. But is not that exactly the class which would apply for relief work?

To a great extent, no doubt, but I think it is a very undeserving class.

2745. With regard to the uniformity of administration in London, and the scale which you think should be fixed, I think I gather that you would like to see a minimum fixed?

Yes.

2746. Earl of Milltown.] What you want, as far as I understand, in the case of the deserving poor, is that the work that they should be set to do should be not so much a test as something done for the payment that they receive?

Yes.
2747. But I do not quite understand why you say that the operation of the Poor Law is a failure in London?

It is a failure under very great stress, such as a long-continued frost.

2748. But by saying that it is a failure, do you mean that it does not reach the destitute?

In this way: In the case of many boards of guardians, the opinion prevails, and I believe correctly, that the conditions of relief are so hard that people will rather suffer the extremity of distress than apply to them, and they will beg rather.

2749. Will you explain the term "conditions of relief"? Do you mean the tests which are necessary before relief can be obtained, or the amount of relief which is given?

To a certain extent both; but, in many cases, there is nothing but the house offered. Now what I would urge would be, that in the case of those moderately deserving people (of course they grade from very bad to decent people), the husband himself might be taken into the house, and set to work, the family being kept outside, so as not to break up the home. The terrible thing is this, if there is a home to break up, the board of guardians may say, "We will not give you any relief out of the house; you must come into the house."

2750. Then you think that the house test, without some modification such as you have suggested, is too severe?

Yes, it is a cruel test.

2751. Take the cases you gave us at Battersea and Rotherhithe; they are not cases that have actually occurred, as I understand?

Those cases are gathered from a letter by Mr. Ackworth (I think you have had them before you), in "The Times," giving the whole account of the working of the Poor Law in London, and giving the different scales of relief in the different unions. I simply picked out these two as two extremes.

2752. You picked out these two as cases that might occur in those two unions?

Yes.

2753. But you are not aware that such cases did occur?

I should take it for granted that in both these unions people will have applied for relief, and, if so, they will have got that scale.

2754. May not the smaller amount have been given to make up a sufficiency of support to those who already had something?

I think that would be illegal.

2755. Surely out-door relief is given in that way where a man has something from a benefit club, or something of that sort?

I think not. I think it is only where a person is absolutely destitute that Poor Law relief can be given.

2756. In putting my questions to you I had it in my mind that that is the practice?

Then that is not given to the destitute.

2757. If a man has not enough to keep himself and his family from starving, surely he is destitute?

Decidedly.

2758. Supposing, in one case out-door relief is administered in that way, so as to supplement slight but not sufficient existing resources, it would be extremely difficult to lay down, would it not, a uniform scale of relief?

I should not think so. In this way: Supposing we take a man with four children, and say that 10s. a week was adequate to keep him from destitution; and supposing the board of guardians, acting on the principle which you speak of, found he had 5s. from a club, they would then give him 5s. more to make up the 10s.; but 10s. would be the amount.
2759. You are, under present circumstances, in favour of the labour yard, as I understand you?
Personally, but as I said I could not put my theory against the actual experience of these guardians who have studied the subject.

2760. But I understand that you consider the labour yard in connection with outdoor or indoor relief?
I would, myself, give no outdoor relief, but I would use the labour yard very much as Birmingham uses its labour test house.

2761. And it is, as I understand you, under those circumstances alone that you would advocate it. I was going to ask you, do you consider it the duty of the State to provide work for the unemployed?
Indirectly. Not the State, but the parishes. I think it ought to be clearly distinguished that all relief comes through the parish, and that the State, as a State, has nothing to do with it. The parishes are bound to provide sustenance, and therefore they would be wise also to provide labour in order to show that the sustenance was not got too easily.

2762. But I thought you complained just now that it was got too hardly?
In some parishes, but not by any means in all. It is this very want of uniformity that causes the difficulty. A beggar applies to you and you cannot say whether he can, in his particular parish, get relief under reasonable conditions; if you knew he could you would at once say, "Go to the parish."

2763. Earl Spencer.] When you talked of the uncertainty as shown by the Rotherhithe and Battersea cases, you would relieve that by giving relief indoors, not out of doors?
Indoors not out of doors.

2764. And you would consider that that indoor test may be applied more severely or less severely, according to whether you have the man in or the whole family?
Yes, quite so. In other words, I think that in a large number of cases it is very cruel to break up the home, but that it would be unwise to relieve the man except by assisting through his coming in and requiring that he did adequate work, or at any rate had a strong test, if he was willing to work.

2765. Besides the Poor Law relief, you would have the vestries giving the work, which would not be connected with the Poor Law administration?
Exactly. I would have the guardians pass over the deserving to the vestry.

2766. Lord Thring.] I understand your system to be shortly this: that you say that the workhouse is too harsh a test in some cases?
In some cases.

2767. Therefore you say it is the duty of the community, I do not mean the State, to do this; to find work in all cases where the workhouse would be too hard a test; that is what it comes to?
I hardly think that. The workhouse, test as I understand, it is breaking up the home.

2768. You object to breaking up the home; therefore, where you consider the workhouse test would be too hard a test from the circumstance of its breaking up the home or from its degrading men, as it would do, who are men of good character, in that case you say it is the duty of the community not to give a man the workhouse, but to give him proper labour, not penal labour?
Not penal labour.

2769. But that is the system?
That is the system.

2770. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] The Chairman just now invited you to explain what you meant by a deserving person applying for relief, and I understood you to say that you would consider an undeserving person to be one who had had high wages all through the summer, had put by nothing, and then had come
come upon the rates in the winter; in fact, to that extent you would consider "undeserving" and "thriftless" as coincident expressions?

Yes.

2771. I should like to put the Chairman's question a little further, and supposing by an undeserving person we understand a man absolutely without character, say a person who had come out of prison a week before, and supposing such a person as that goes for relief to the authorities, do you consider that the authorities would be justified in refusing him relief, and telling him to wait till he was deserving; would the law justify them in that?

No, he would have the ordinary relief of the destitute with the workhouse test.

2772. But if you could would you punish a person whom you would consider undeserving by making it possible for the workhouse authorities not to give him any relief at all?

No; destitution, I look upon it, must absolutely claim relief.

2773. As destitution?

As destitution.

2774. I wanted that quite clear. Have you in your experience (you have evidently thought a great deal about the subject) come to any clear notion in your mind how thoughtlessness, which really lies at the root of much of their distress and misery, can be mended among the English people?

It must be only by making the conditions of relief hard. I do not see any other way.

2775. By compelling economic habits of living?

Yes.

2776. And providence?

And providence.

2777. And you think in course of time, perhaps in a generation, if people suffered very much from being refused relief except under the most stringent circumstances, that would compel people to become thrifty?

It would help. I think a great deal of the thriftlessness of the poor has been owing in the past to the thriftlessness working of the old Poor Law.

2778. Have you any hope at all from the methods of education in the School Board schools that the children taught in those schools might be improved in habits of thrift?

I think all are helps.

2779. Do you think that it is possible, with respect to the necessities of the class above the artizan and labouring class, ever to relieve them otherwise than by quite private means?

No.

2780. Earl of Strafford.] Do you think that the number of immigrants from the country districts during the last three years has helped at all to aggravate the difficulty of Poor Law relief in the metropolis?

I should think it must have done so, and not only from the country districts, but the immigration of foreigners.

2781. You know, I dare say, that a Committee is sitting on that point?

I do.

2782. But I meant as regards our own poor in the rural districts, that as the result of agricultural depression labourers are no longer able to be employed, and it is said that they come to London in large numbers; do you think that is the case?

I can only refer, in reply to that question, to one of the questions given by the Committee, of which I have spoken; the reply was, "Undoubtedly, to a considerable extent, and that the young labourer from the country displaced (70.)
the older labourers who were getting a little worn out, especially in the docks."

2784. And do you think that this immigration has been going on during the last three months? I doubt it.

2785. The class of agricultural labourer would hardly take the place of trained dock labourers, would he, because that is a special class of work? Not the ordinary dock labourer's work; there are different kinds of dock labourers; there are stevedores and others who are skilled, but the greater number of them simply move heavy things, which anybody can do.

2786. Do you think that during the winters of 1884-85 and 1885-86 that great number did help to aggravate the burden of the Poor Law in London? Yes.

2787. Lord Thrang.] Have you any personal knowledge of this? No, only replies made to our inquiries in the Mansion House Council.

2788. Chairman.] But inasmuch as the Poor Law Returns show that there is no serious increase, if any increase at all, of pauperism in the agricultural districts, why do you suppose so many persons come in from those districts into London? Simply from the replies that were made and from conversations with a good many of the poor themselves as to the reason of their being in distress.

2789. There are a great many, of course, come into London in all times, but do you think that the cause really existed to the extent that these people represented; was it not rather an excuse for their own want of employment? It is quite possible it did exist to a certain extent, but it is very difficult in a place like London to state the extent.

2790. Earl of Strafford.] Do you think, during the past winter, that immigration has continued? I should not like to say; I have simply an impression; my impression is that it is not so great.

2791. Chairman.] I should like to have a little more explanation about the question of families; I think I rather misunderstood you as to the evils arising from large families; I gather that you do not object to early marriages? I strongly advocate early marriages, if any means can be contrived by which young people can be married without probable ruin to themselves through the over-production of children.

2792. Have you considered whether there are any such means? I think I replied to that before; I said that it is a question that ought to be ventilated.

2793. I do not like to press you much further, but you will see that it leaves the matter in rather an unsatisfactory position to say that you regard one of the principal causes of poverty to be the over-production of children, that you are in favour, on the whole, of early marriages, but you do not see your way to remedy the evil by any practical means?

If you wish really for what is in the bottom of my mind, I believe it is a doctor's question, a physical question.

2794. Earl of Aberdeen.] I gathered that you wished to suggest that it was very desirable that this question should be thought over, and, if necessary, discussed under proper conditions by experienced people?

Yes.

2795. You do not come here with the view of suggesting any theories which you have yourself formed? No.

2796. You consider the whole question as one of difficulty and delicacy? A moral and physical question that ought to be treated in the most delicate
and careful way, but at present I do not think there is sufficient light thrown upon it for anyone to form a conclusion.

2790. Therefore your remarks only refer to the great importance of ventilating the question without indicating any particular view of your own?
There is an evil, and I cannot believe but what there is a proper cure for it, but I do not see any way.

2797. Reference was made to the Charity Organization Societies; you did not, I understand, indicate any disparagement of the work of the Charity Organization Societies in general?
Certainly not; I think they have done, and are doing, an immense deal; I only said that one portion of their work, I thought, which absorbed a great deal of their attention, belonged to the Poor Law. There would be still plenty of room for them in other parts of their work.

2798. You mentioned that you had not been able to refer to an actual copy of the Report of the Poor Law Commissioners of 1834; that may have been owing to the fact that it has been for a long time out of print?
I did not know where to get one.

2799. You were not aware, perhaps, that it was out of print, and was only recently reprinted?
I sought for the information I wanted in the best encyclopædias, as they generally give the best information.

2800. As to the too great severity in connection with the conditions under which relief is given, I suppose you might say that what might in one case relieve, would in another case be severe?
Undoubtedly; as for instance, if a person had a decent home, to break it up might be severe; whereas if he had a very bad home, a wretched place, it might be quite right to break it up.

2801. Generally speaking, you would like to see discrimination and classification?
Yes.

2802. Lord Balfour of Burley.] As we are extremely anxious to get definite particulars about the conditions under which 2s. 4d. was granted at Rotherhithe and 5s. 6d. at Battersea under the same conditions, could you furnish me with the pamphlet in which you saw that?
Yes, I will find it.

2803. Chairman.] You will let us have the reference?
I believe I have the paper myself; if not I will find out where it came from.

2804. Lord Balfour of Burley.] As a uniform scale of relief after labour test, either 5s. 6d. or 2s. 4d. would be open to the remark that they might be or probably would be extremely inadequate if they were a man's whole support?
Five shillings and sixpence for a single man would be, I suppose, ample.

2805. The scale is for a single man, you are sure?
Yes.

2806. Are there any other instances you wish to give of the great want of uniformity of which you complain?
No; I think I give them in that little book you refer to, but they are all given in the different parishes in this pamphlet. Might I say that I think it would be very valuable if a small code of the Poor Law was printed, so that both the guardians and the public themselves might know exactly what their different rights and privileges and duties were.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

(70.)
Mr. James Corry Sherrard, having been called in;
is Examined, as follows:

2807. Earl of Aberdeen.] Are you one of the Poor Law Guardians of the Paddington Union?
I am.

2808. You have, I believe, for a number of years paid a great deal of personal attention to matters connected with the administration of Poor Law relief and the condition of the poor?
I have. My experience extends over a period of more than 30 years with some interruptions, and I have given a great deal of attention to the matter, and latterly in Paddington have taken a very great interest and a very active part in the administration of the Poor Law for some time now.

2809. Apart from your official position as a Poor Law guardian, have you personally gone a great deal amongst the poor as district visitor or connected with ragged schools and so forth?
Yes, I have superintended the Lamb and Flag Ragged School in Clerkenwell now for 12 years; and during those 12 years the school has taken the largest number of prizes for good conduct and long service of any school in London; eight times out of the 12 years. I may also say that I was chairman of the committee of the Sorry Girls' Reformatory at Clapham for over five years, and in that capacity I had a large experience amongst the young women, training them and educating them; and I should like to say something upon that question presently if I am permitted.

2810. Before we go to that I want to ask you your opinion on the question of out-door relief?
I think there has been a great deal of misapprehension as regards the administration of out-door relief. In my judgment indiscriminate out-door relief, or anything approaching to indiscriminate out-door relief, is to be condemned in the most unmeasured terms possible, as it impoverishes and degrades the recipients and is doing a very great injustice to the ratepayers; and in point of fact I may say this: that I think if you desired to manufacture paupers you could not do a better thing than adopt a system of indiscriminate out-door relief; on the other hand I feel that out-door relief wisely and carefully administered may be, and is a great blessing to the poor, and a great economy to the ratepayers.

2811. In what sense do you regard such an administration as an economy to the ratepayers?
If each case is investigated by itself and decided on its merits, then you only reward persons of a deserving character by giving them out-door relief. As regards the saving to the ratepayers, if you will allow me, I will first in a few figures show what I mean. In the Parish of Paddington the out-door relief for the year ending Lady-day 1888 came to 1,713 l. 6 s. 11 d. The permanent cases upon the list were: men 12, women 158, children 70, making a total of 240; and the temporary cases relieved through illness, accidents, and so on, were: men 18, women 19, children 27, or a total of 64; making a grand total of 304. There are 30 men altogether, 177 women, and 97 children. If we take 207 adults, with the 97 children, that makes 304, and the cost 1,713 l.; that gives 5 l. 12 s. 8 d. per child per annum, or 2 s. 2 d. per week. Then those 207 adults mean 180 families, for there are only three of them single men; there are 27 married couples; 180 families cost, each family, 9 l. 10 s. 4 d. per annum, or 3 s. 8 d. per week, that is per family. Now if they were forced into the house the 207 adults would cost 8 s. 1½ d. each, including the establishment charges, coming to, for the 52 weeks, 4,373 l.; and then 97 children at a cost of 3 l. 1 s. 4 d. in the district school would come to 3,011 l., making a total of 7,384 l. That, compared with 1,713 l., will give your Lordships a notion of what the saving may be and is at present in the Parish of Paddington. And of those women I may say that there are 12 widows with 31 children, and those 12 widows receive 3 l. 16 s. 6 d. per week, or about 2 s. 6 d. per week each child; so
so that each child costs the parish 2s. 6d.; whereas, if it were boarded out it would cost 5s, and at a school it would cost 12s. Those are the grounds upon which I say the out-door relief system in the parish of Paddington makes a great economy to the ratepayers, and does a vast deal of good to the recipients. On that question, perhaps, you will let me refer to, as I think, an interesting return which I hold in my hand, with regard to the out-door relief in Paddington. The truth is the success or failure of out-door relief, in my judgment, depends entirely upon the board of guardians who administer it; if they are careful and wise, and thoroughly investigate the cases, then I say that there can be very few abuses in the system of out-door relief; but if you allow me to refer to the out-door relief given in Paddington 20 years ago, I will not trouble you with all the figures, but with those for two years. In the year 1873 the out-door relief in Paddington came to 11,571l, and at that time the population was 96,784. The out-door relief for the year just closed, with 120,000 estimated population, has reached 1,713l. 6s. 11d. Therefore you see, notwithstanding the increase of population, that we have reduced the out-door relief from, in 1873, the greatest amount, 11,571l, down to 1,713l. Now we will take the decade from 1869 to 1878. The gross amount of out-door relief administered in Paddington during those years was 87,543l. 11s. 8d.; and then for the decade from 1879 to 1888, inclusive, we have 23,303l. 2s. 4d. So that your Lordships will see what the change in the administration has been, and how good management has succeeded in reducing the out-door relief by that amount. Now you will probably ask me, if, having reduced the out-door relief to that small sum, there is a commensurate increase of the indoor inmates; and that is not so. Making allowance for the 20 per cent. increase of population, in point of fact, I may say they are pretty nearly practically the same; for here we will take the year 1877. There were then 562 inmates in the workhouse.

[2812. Chairman.] What time of the year was that?
That is, taking the average all through. But I do not find that there has been a commensurate increase by any means in the indoor proportion.

2813. Will you give us the figures?
I will take 1885; I must take 1885, for this reason, that our infirmary was opened the following year, and that has totally deranged the whole calculation. I will therefore take 1885; the number of inmates then was 662, and it happens that in 1877 there were 562 inmates, and the population then was 96,000, and now it is 120,000, or nearly so, in the year 1885.

2814. Can you tell us, between 1877 and 1885, whether there was at any time any considerable increase in the number of indoor paupers?
No, there was not. The figures are 562 inmates in 1877; 562 in 1878; 609 in 1879; 598 in 1880; 592 in 1881; 608 in 1882; 658 in 1883; 673 in 1884; 662 in 1885; and then comes the infirmary, and that has entirely disarranged the whole thing.

2815. Earl of Aberdeen.] But taking into account the increase of population, how will the figures compare between 1877 and 1885?
Taking that view of the case, if you allow the 20 per cent., adding on 20 per cent. to 562, makes 662; it is practically the same. So, in point of fact, the number of indoor paupers has not practically seriously increased at all, owing to the diminution of out-door relief.

2816. Then to what do you attribute this apparent decrease of pauperism in Paddington?
I attribute it entirely I may say, to the careful and faithful management of the guardians, because the Board of Guardians of Paddington never give out-door relief until they have first thoroughly investigated the case itself, and decided it upon its merits; and if there is any doubt whatever as to the character of the person applying, a guardian goes himself, or herself, and investigates the case, and reports the result.

[2817. Chairman.] Is it in any way, in your opinion, attributable to you (70.)

R n
having offered the alternative of the house more frequently than you did before?

No; I do not think it is. We offer the alternative of the house less frequently than we did before. When I joined the board of guardians four or five years ago, the invariable rule was to offer every applicant the test of the house; but now that is not the case.

2818. But then if four or five years ago you pursued that plan, would it be unreasonable to conclude that it was probably that constant offering of the house that produced that large reduction in the amount of pauperism?

No; I should not think that had produced it, because there has been plenty of time since then to recover from that effect. I attribute it entirely to the management which has been adopted, and to the care taken in the administration of the Poor Law.

2819. That will be a matter of opinion; but as a matter of fact, I gather from you that there did come a time when the guardians did constantly offer the alternative of the house?

Yes.

2820. And it appears also that that coincided with a large diminution in the amount of pauperism?

There is no doubt whatever that it began about that period to decline.

2821. Then might I not possibly draw the conclusion that the breaking the neck of this very large amount of pauperism was due to the offer of the house, and that the subsequent good administration has maintained that reduction so gained?

It was due to the knowledge which people got that this Board, or the late Board, would do what was right, and give them out-door relief or in-door relief, according to the circumstances of the case. It appears to me now that people are satisfied, and that they think justice is done, and that there is not that indiscriminate relief that was given. I will read the figures of out-door relief. In 1869 they gave 8,146 l. (it was practically indiscriminate all those years); in 1870 they gave 9,479 l.; in 1871 they gave 9,900 l.; in 1872, 11,613 l.; in 1873, 11,570 l.; then in 1874 it dropped suddenly by 2,000 l.

2822. Earl of Aberdeen.] Was that when the guardians began to offer the house so freely?

I am not aware that the house was freely offered them; I think not. I think the ratepayers rather made a disturbance about it. They were rather alarmed, seeing the amount going on increasing. No, I do not think the house was freely offered at that period. The house began to be freely offered, as far as I can understand, about the year 1880 or 1881; it dropped then suddenly,

2823. The ratepayers brought pressure to bear upon the guardians, you believe?

Yes, so I am told; I was not a guardian; but the ratepayers. I understand, did bring a pressure to bear when they found the out-door relief becoming so frightfully burdensome.

2824. In your experience, are the ratepayers, or a large portion of them, apt to look with favour upon a considerable amount of out-door relief?

I think they do. I think you are a more popular guardian if you advocate out-door relief.

2825. To what do you attribute that?

To a general feeling of humanity; they think poor people ought to have something if they are in distress; it is a mistaken feeling, but still it does exist to a large extent; I can account for it in no other way.

2826. You do not think the question of wages comes in?

No, not in Paddington. I have no reason to apprehend that that is so.

2827. You have referred incidentally to district schools; what is the practice in Paddington in regard to the district schools?

With
With regard to the district schools, the parish of Paddington is not in favour of district schools; they do not think the district schools the best way of training children. I very much prefer reading a resolution passed by the board of guardians, which will explain better than I can do, perhaps, what their view is: "As regards the best manner of dealing with pauper children, the guardians consider, (1) That deserted children and orphans should be either emigrated or boarded-out, and they greatly regret that they are by law precluded from dealing with other children in like manner; (2) That the children of vicious parents, or of parents who have shown themselves unmindful of their duties towards their children, or who are unable to fulfil them, should be brought up in small country homes, under the control of the guardians, containing not more than 20 children each, and, if found convenient, should be educated at the village school; (3) That the cases of children of parents of good repute should be specially considered, in order that, if advisable, the parents should be constituted the children's guardians, and a weekly sum allowed, sufficient, with the parents' earnings, to enable the children to be properly brought up. As regards this last class of cases, the guardians recognize that the action proposed would have to be carefully watched, and only agreed upon after thorough inquiry; but they believe that such methods of dealing with their pauper children will be more economical as well as more effective than the present system." Then, with regard to their opinion of the Ashford Schools, I may read this resolution: I am bound to say that all the guardians have not the same very strong objection that I have to the district schools, but here they passed a resolution on the 13th May 1885, as follows: "Resolved that an advertisement be inserted in 'The Metropolitan' to the effect that the Paddington Board of Guardians are desirous of receiving communications from boards of guardians who require school accommodation. And that the Local Government Board be informed accordingly, and requested to make an equitable proportion of school places between the Unions of Fulham and St. George, Hanover Square, and the parish of Paddington, in order that the guardians may estimate the value of the property they have to dispose of." So the Paddington guardians were at that time, and they are still anxious to part with their interest in these schools if they could get anything like a fair equivalent.

2828. On what ground do you think the district schools are not desirable?

I think the district schools are to be condemned as a principle, because I find that the children turned out of those schools are for the most part wanting in intelligence. Of course, I am aware that there are exceptions to every rule, but as a rule (and I take a great deal of trouble to investigate every case that comes before me), I find that they are dull, and that they are wanting in intelligence, and that they have no practical knowledge whatever of life; that they are brought up together in large masses, and they have no practical training, therefore they have no self-reliance, and are not fitted to battle with the outside world at all. And it is especially bad for the girls; I have found that the girls really are helpless. If we get situations for them, or the Board gets situations for them, they do not keep them; they know nothing, and the mistresses are dissatisfied and they get discharged, and then many of them, I am afraid, go wrong. But, I think, really the district schools are, first of all, under triple management; we have three boards, St. George, Paddington, and Fulham, and they all have representatives on that board; and under that triple management I do not see how they could succeed, because the parish of Fulham, for instance, is totally different from us; they like these schools very much and they send the complement which we fail to send; we send as few children to the Ashford Schools as it is possible; we board out all the children who are orphans or deserted at once; and with regard to other children that we wish to deal with, if the parents are respectable and industrious and at all able to manage them, we supplement their earnings, and induce them to keep the children at home; and that I hold to be decidedly the best system of managing children if you can do it, because they learn to work while they are young. I am a great advocate for teaching to work. I hold that a boy or girl that has not learned to work before 12 years of age will never work; and I found in the Surrey Girls' Reformatory almost invariably that when those girls came (70.)
into the reformatory they detested work, but after perseverance for a year or two these girls were so amenable to good influences that they really showed such a desire that they vied with each other who should be the most industrious, and they got up in the morning at five o'clock and were ready at the doors, when they were unlocked, to come down to the laundry; and the consequence was that we had no difficulty whatever in getting excellent places for these girls; and I never allowed a girl to go for less than 8L, and we have got as much as 12L straight out of the reformatory for those girls; and they liked work for work's sake, which is not the character I can give of the adult population. I happen to be chairman of the visiting magistrates at Wandsworth Prison now, and I find that the dislike of work is steadily, I am afraid, increasing, and therefore I think everything should be done to encourage the young, particularly, to love work and to work.

2829. I understand that you would like to see larger powers given to the guardians by law to enable them to deal with pauper children, not only those orphans or deserted?

Yes; I think that the guardians are very much hampered by some regulations of the Local Government Board. For instance, we cannot now board out any child under two or over 10 years of age; we find that to be attended with very great inconvenience, and I think it is wrong. I think the children ought to be got rid of as soon as possible into the country, and why they should be kept for two years under bad influences and in a bad atmosphere, I cannot understand. As to the age of 10, it often happens that you want to put brothers together; if the one brother happens to be just over 10, you have to separate the brothers; that, we consider, we ought to have some discretionary power about. Also as regards the payment; we can only pay now 5s., in the gross, for every child. It so happened that a girl was returned to the workhouse here a few weeks ago, for theft; they found her unmanageable in the North of England; and to deal with that girl we got a lady down in Essex who agreed to take the girl and put her into a home, with the result that we have to pay for her 6s. instead of 5s. To get that extra shilling the chairman and myself contributed each half in order to save her. We think we ought to have discretionary power; if we are competent to deal with these children we think we should not be tied down to an exact figure, in those particular cases, of 5s.

2830. Still, upon the question of children, do you think anything can be done in regard to those unfortunate children who are employed by parents or by supposed parents to sing in the streets and so forth?

I have a very strong opinion that it would be most desirable that those parents on conviction should forfeit their claim on their children, and that the board of guardians should take possession of them with a view to boarding out and emigration subsequently. I think it would be a very important improvement in the Poor Law if without those children being taken before a magistrate on the conviction of a parent for singing in the street and begging and so on, the board of guardians could at once be placed in loco parentis, and be enabled to deal with them by sending them to an industrial home and getting them clean away from the influence of these parents; for your Lordships know very well that these degraded parents use these schools and conveniences just for the purpose of training their children, and the moment they become of an age to earn money they take them out and use them for all sorts of bad purposes.

2831. Do you think that the labouring classes are in the main suffering much the same privation now as in former years, or has there been a decrease in the amount of poverty?

I am sorry to say that I cannot say that there has. I was a member of the committee formed in Paddington this last winter for the purpose of helping the unemployed, and I sat on that committee for three months, almost every moment I had to spare, and I had an opportunity of testing and really searching out and knowing the condition of the working classes, and it was most deplorable. I must confess that it was difficult sometimes to sit there and hear these
these tales of misery and destitution which came before us; it was absolutely incredible that in a rich metropolis like this we should have such a number of persons not only out of employment but in a state of absolute starvation, having in many cases pawned their sheets and their blankets, and those people deserving people; and during that investigation I had an opportunity of ascertaining the condition of these persons, the young parents who many times came before us with their children in a starving condition. I asked a great many questions, and I quite satisfied myself that the most destitute cases that came before our committee were those of persons who had married at the ages of 16, 17, and 18, without any sort of prospect or means of maintaining their progeny, and these persons were in the most destitute condition of all, and a great number of these persons came before me.

2832. Had these people usually applied already to the Poor Law authorities? Hardly any of them.

2833. What was their reason for not applying? They would rather die, they said, than go to the workhouse; many of them were absolutely starving, and yet they did not go to the workhouse.

2834. Chairman.] Did any of them starve? That I cannot say.

2835. You stated that they said they were absolutely starving? So they were.

2836. But is that possible: is it possible that they could be actually starving and without there having been deaths from starvation to a large extent. The number of such deaths, I think, reported in the metropolis last year was 32. If there had been this widespread, absolute destitution, is it possible that 32 would have been the outside number? When these people came before us and we gave them bread, they accepted it most greedily, and were only too thankful to get it.

2837. But do you believe that if these people did not receive the relief which you say they got from other sources, they would have starved sooner than go to the workhouse?

They said so.

2838. What is your opinion? That rather than have gone to the workhouse they would have died. They absolutely pawned their wedding rings and their sheets; and I personally saw their homes.

2839. Do you think it is a matter for regret that there should be such a feeling amongst the poorer population, that they would resort to every possible means rather than put themselves on the rates?

I encourage them at all times to avoid going to the board of guardians; my advice to them is, "Maintain your independence and do not go to the board of guardians."

2840. Then what was there to deplore except the poverty of the people? That is all I do deplore.

2841. Earl of Aberdeen.] I understand that your answer was given to show that the statement of poverty was not really based on sentimental grounds, but a matter of fact in your own personal knowledge.

Yes, that is what I mean to convey; I convey nothing more than that, that the actual physical suffering was what I say, because other gentlemen sat there as I did, and they all agreed that it was something they could scarcely have believed.

2842. Chairman.] But looking to the state of things which you describe, do you consider that the Poor Law administration in Paddington is sufficient to deal with the destitution?

I do, quite sufficient; we have had no difficulty whatever in Paddington with regard to the administration of the Poor Law. Every case that comes before (70.).
the board is dealt with and we have no difficulty whatever, and no complaint whatever; but there are a class of persons, and I think a deserving class of persons, who will not go to the board of guardians; in fact, I have known cases of death where they would not go to the board of guardians and they slowly starved, and I have known women for years slowly starving and who died ultimately.

2843. With regard to those cases with which you yourself are personally acquainted, do you think the Poor Law ought to be altered in any way, or that it is sufficient as it stands to meet all reasonable cases, and that no further steps are necessary to prevent such occurrences as you have described?

I think the Poor Law is an admirable law, and I want to see no alteration whatever, except in a few details giving more power to the guardians of dealing with certain cases which I will put before your Lordships in a few minutes, where, I think, you will find that the law is very defective, and where, I think, as regards in-door relief, the law now not only tolerates but forces upon boards of guardians acts that they otherwise would not and could not commit, but which they are bound by the law to commit.

2844. Then, I think, I am right in saying that I should not draw a fair inference from your statement if I were to suppose that anything you have said, with reference to the poverty of the classes in Paddington, implies dissatisfaction with the general Poor Law?

No, quite the contrary, though I am not one of those who consider that the Poor Law is altogether good; I think it has done a great deal of harm.

2845. Earl of Aberdeen.] You were giving us your opinion as to some of the chief causes for this distressing amount of poverty; will you go a little further upon that point?

I think the first grand cause is to be found in the improvidenoe of the working classes. The working classes, as a rule, will spend what they earn; whatever wages a man earns he feels justified in spending, and then that is spent for the most part in the public-house, and that, of course, acts and re-acts; and that seems to me to be really the basis of the most part of this suffering, except the want of employment; the want of employment is, of course, the first thing. I maintain that there are more people in this country than work can be found for; I am very confident that there are more persons in the metropolis than there is work to be got for, and I have known cases of men tramping about for six or eight weeks, and not earning anything whatever; men respectable and industrious, willing and ready to do work, but who cannot get it; and at this moment I know three such men that fail to get work, they only get a job now and then. Therefore I do say that something must be done. I believe myself that unless agricultural prosperity can be restored in some way, you will have this congestion in the large towns going on and getting worse; and unless you shut out these foreign paupers who flood the East End, the same result will follow. They come in in large numbers and compete with the English men and women, and in consequence their wages are reduced and they get no employment, and are in great straits owing to these causes. So that I should very much like indeed to see employment for the people in the country by the farmers again, and also that these foreigners should be shut out from flooding the labour market.

2846. Then as to emigration, what have you to say?

With regard to emigration, I have a strong belief in the present state of things there is no other means of relief. Emigration ought to be undertaken, in my judgment, on a very large scale, and I think Lord Meath's proposition appears to me to meet the difficulty better than any other I have yet found. But I omitted to say one thing as regards the cure for that improvidence we were just discussing. I think that Canon Blackley's scheme, with some modifications, ought to be introduced.

2847. Compulsory insurance, I mean?

Yes; compulsory insurance; if compulsory insurance could be in any way achieved, I think that would do an enormous amount of good.

2848. Upon
2848. Upon the question of overcrowding, I want to ask you your opinion from experience as to its effects?

My opinion of overcrowding is that that is really causing a large proportion of the immorality that exists, and I think it also forces on these early marriages. Where the sexes are brought into close contact in these crowded rooms, it is not in human nature to resist the temptations. These girls are in many cases seduced first, and then afterwards married. I have found that in many cases the parents of the girl have forced the man to marry her, and then they drop into this miserable poverty; but I think if the dwellings were improved, there is not the least doubt that that would be one way of improving the morality of these persons who now fall into such a state.

2849. But when a mass of dwellings are condemned, the demolition of those dwellings of course increases the overcrowding?

It makes it a great deal worse. In Clerkenwell we have had many cases of that kind; they will not leave the locality; they crowd into the same rooms; and I should say the condition is worse.

2850. Have you any other topic you wish to mention?

Yes, with regard to the cost of these district schools, and to the result to the public, the cost to them of these children. It appears to me that something should be done to alter this state of things. I, first of all, will show what the cost of these district schools is. In the West London Schools, according to their own return, which I hold in my hand here, the expenditure for the last year was 15,230 l. 12 s. 7 d.; repayment of loans and interest, 4,965 l. 1 s. 6 d.; making a total of 20,195 l. 14 s. 1 d.

2851. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Is that at Ashford?

Yes, the Ashford S-hools. And the average number was 650 children. If you divide that amount by 650 it will give you 31 l. 1 s. 4 d. exactly as the annual cost of each child, or 12 s. a week. Now we have at the school, at the present time, only 73 children, because we are continually boarding out and dealing with children in other ways. We have boarded out 64, and there are 12 widows supporting 31 children, making a total of 168. I have already said that those 31 children only cost 2 s. 6 d. each. The maintenance at this school is 12 l. 6 s. per annum, and the establishment expenses are 18 l. 15 s. 4 d.; so that before you put a cost on a child's back or give a bit of food it costs 18 l. 15 s. 4 d. for the establishment expenses only, which appears to me very large. We have got at the present time at least two paupers in the Paddington Workhouse, men of 35 or 40 years of age, and a third who is not in the workhouse but whose children are at the school, and I will just give you the figures as regards those persons. Of these three paupers one has four children, another five, and the third three, and those children are at the Ashford S-hools; we have no power to deal in any other way with them, and if you calculate what those children are to cost the public up to the age of 14, you will find that one of the families will have cost 690 l., the second 810 l., and the third 750 l., making a total of 2,250 l., which, divided by three, gives you an average of 750 l. as the amount which each family is to cost the public until they are of age to earn their bread. Now we will take another view of it. If you calculate the cost of these children from the time they became chargeable, you will find that one family will have cost, if they are all kept there till they are 14 years of age, 1,650 l.; another family will cost 1,140 l.; and the third 990 l., making a total of 3,780 l., or an average of 1,260 l. for each family. Then we will take the annual cost of these families; 12 children at 31 l. 1 s. 4 d. each will come to 372 l. 16 s. Then the two adults who are in the workhouse will cost 42 l. 5 s., making a total of 415 l. 1 s.; that, divided by three, gives 138 l. as the amount which each pauper family is costing per annum, and there is one family costing 176 l. 2 s. 6 d. a year at these schools.

2852. Chairman.] What remedy do you propose for these cases?

The remedy I propose is this: I will just read a resolution passed by the board of guardians on the 23rd November last with reference to that question: 'That this Board address the Local Government Board on the subject of able-bodied
bodied parents who take up their residence in the workhouse with their children, remaining therein permanently; and that the Local Government Board be requested to issue an order empowering the guardians to board out the children of such able-bodied parents if they remain in the workhouse over a year." I should like to go further than that, and to have power not only to board them out, but to emigrate them. I think boarding out is a very imperfect way of doing it, because these degraded people, the moment they find the children of an age to earn money, will pounce upon them and use them for that purpose; and I should like the power of sending them to an industrial home for a twelvemonth and then emigrating them; and I say that such a law cannot be a good or wise law which has forced upon us such an expenditure. We are all very anxious to avoid it, but the law says, You shall do it.

2853. Earl of Aberdeen.] Will you mention the other points on which you think some alteration might be made? The first point (I have already alluded to it) is with regard to those vagrants who go singing about the streets with their own or other people's children. I think power should be given to deal with those children by sending them to industrial homes and emigrating them; and then, with regard to the boarding out, I have already mentioned that we are tied down to the limits of two years and ten years, and we want more discretionary powers.

2854. Can you specify any other point? I really myself think the law so perfect that it wants very little alteration, except with regard to those points. I think the Poor Law appears to have been framed with immense discretion and care, as far as I can see. There is another thing I wish to mention if you will allow me, and that is this: It has been proposed that some legal co-operation should be established between parochial and other outside committees or societies and the boards of guardians. Now, I have a very strong objection personally to that proposition, because I think it would lead to a very great difficulty, and we should have reports from these private societies leading to scandal and slander, because those reports as to character would be obtained by persons who, though excellent persons (district visitors and sisters and persons of that class), most benevolent, yet have no experience; and therefore to take the characters of applicants for relief given by those persons to the boards of guardians would be a very dangerous thing; and, in point of fact, I think it would also lessen the responsibility of relieving officers, who are now legally responsible. If you employed a sufficient number of efficient relieving officers I do not see what good this outside co-operation would produce.

2855. But are there not many cases which come before the Poor Law guardians which are deserving of consideration, but not of the kind which they are authorised to relieve? Occasionally such cases do occur, but then these committees and societies are perfectly open for these persons to apply to before they come to the board of guardians. If these persons wish for relief from these outside societies they know perfectly well where they are, and they can apply to them, and if they fail they can come to us; but I do not see why they should come to us in the first instance, because these societies exist in the parish, and, of course, they can apply to them first; and I am quite sure that the proposed co-operation would lead to great difficulty. Now, already I have thought it my duty to bring forward a vote of censure upon one of these committees. We had an agreement with two of these committees in Paddington; and the action of one committee was such with regard to a poor woman, that I felt it my duty to bring forward before the board a vote of censure upon that committee, and I only lost my motion by the casting-vote of the chairman, who was strongly in favour of the co-operation of outside committees.

2856. Earl of Milltown.] What was the vote of censure for? The vicar of the parish, who is the chairman of the committee, had stated at our conference publicly that a woman was a drunkard, and the honorary secretary of that same committee came to our relief committee and stated that
a certain person had been dismissed by our chairman (who has a workroom in Harrow-road) for being drunk, and we found on inquiry that it was absolutely untrue. I thought that persons ought not to have anything to do with us who were so careless as to deal with characters so lightly as that, and make a public statement like that before 60 or 70 ladies and gentlemen, which I found not to be true. I thought persons of that sort ought not to have the power of injuring character, and therefore were worthy of a vote of censure; that was my ground for proposing it. I think that character should be dealt with very tenderly, and any aspersion upon character which is unjust is a shameful act.

2857. Is there not a legal remedy for such aspersions upon character? What can a pauper do with regard to a legal remedy?

2858. Lord Thring.] I understand you object to these societies because you do not trust them?

No. I object on principle to the societies being incorporated in any shape or form with the board of guardians who have statutory powers. I say that the more distinct you keep them from any other body the better, because they use one power, a legal power, and the others are only amateurs; and I think mixing up amateurs with the properly authorised legal guardians is a dangerous and wrong thing.

2859. I do not follow you; I can understand a society behaving badly; but supposing a board of guardians examine into a case, and that they find that instead of being a case which ought to be relieved under the Poor Law it is a case which ought to be referred to a society, why should they not refer it to the society?

I have already said that these persons who are in need of assistance can apply just as well directly to these societies as through the board of guardians.

2860. No; because the board of guardians is the legal tribunal to which they ought first to appeal; but if they appeal to the board of guardians, and that board thinks it not a case to which they ought to give relief, why should not that board refer them to a society?

I do not see the slightest reason why they should not; what I object to is the board of guardians accepting the character of an applicant from an outside society.

2861. But supposing you alter the relations between the board of guardians and the society altogether, and the society says, "We trust the board of guardians, and we wish the board of guardians to intimate to us cases where they think the Poor Law will not afford relief;" is that objectionable?

I do not object to that the least in the world; my observations had reference to character being taken away by reports from these outside societies.

2862. Earl Spencer.] There was an answer you gave about the education of children; I understood you to say that you thought it was desirable that they should be educated at home rather than in these district schools?

Yes, I do.

2863. What cases are those; are those cases where a parent is destitute, and you used the word "parents;" so that I presume you meant cases where both parents were alive?

If so, I made a mistake; I meant widows. Now there is such a network of Board schools all over the metropolis, excellent schools where education of the highest order is procured, that to have those children kept at home and sent to those schools is the wiser course, in my opinion, for the reason that they are taught to work early. I am a great advocate for teaching children to work at an early age, and if they do not learn to work before 12 they will have no taste for work; I have discovered that in my own experience; and therefore I say that the home training is the more valuable sort of training, and it is the natural training. If the woman is a respectable, industrious, healthy woman, why should she not manage her own children, and get a little assistance from (70.)
the rates? That is our principle now, and now the board of guardians in Paddington are adopting that system very largely.

2864. Earl of Milltown.] Do I understand you to advocate compulsorily taking the children of vicious or neglectful parents altogether out of their charge permanently?

I do, permanently: I think they are a degraded class of people, and I do not think such people as those I was speaking of just now in the house who have been there for two or three years, are entitled to exercise a parent's control; therefore I should permanently take them from them and emigrate them to save all this enormous expense.

2865. I presume, after you have emigrated them you would have to look after them when emigrated?

Yes, for that provision is made.

2866. Until they are at such an age when they could fairly be expected to earn their living?

No; in Canada the children are taken up at once and adopted by the farmers and other people without any expense; all you have to do is to arrange that, when they arrive there they are placed out by some of these agents, and then farmers and other persons adopt them and they become Canadians.

2867. But do you think that they would be fit for Canadian life?

I should be extremely careful of sending out children of that sort before they had had 12 months' training. Then I have heard Sir Charles Tupper himself state that there was room for any number of children in Canada.

2868. Chairman.] Do you not think that the Canadian Government, when they heard that such a system was established here, would object to any more children of vicious parents being sent out?

I find they are already making objection; but they do not object when the children have been first properly trained. Many indiscreet people have sent out shiploads of adults and children without any training whatever, and the Canadian Government have become disgusted; but Dr. Barnardo, who has emigrated 600 children this year, says he finds no difficulty whatever in getting them received.

2869. Up to the present time the children sent out have at all events ostensibly been orphan or deserted children; but supposing it was announced that we had adopted as part of our Poor Law system the taking away from bad parents of their children, and sending them to Canada, would they allow that to go on.

I think if they found the children were suitable, and gave satisfaction, they would not make any inquiry about it. Dr. Barnardo takes out this class of children in large numbers.

2870. Earl of Milltown.] It would entail, would it not, a very considerable additional charge upon the rates.

I think just the contrary. I have just shown you at what enormous cost these children are maintained in school.

2871. But if you did not take them away from the parents, the parents would be obliged to support them themselves. Vicious and neglectful parents are a very large number of the population, are they not?

I should be very sorry to say that. And besides, it is a cheaper way in the end; these children would grow up to be paupers, and the result to the ratepayers of emigrating them would be cheaper than now. Taking the bull by the horns, and getting the children clear out of the country, would in the end be a saving to the ratepayers.

2872. But would there not be a considerable outcry and objection raised to your compulsorily taking away children from their parents?

I think it is quite possible there would be so at first, but (as I found in another matter) people would after a time approve of it, and the outcry would cease.
Mr. Sherrard.  

2873. Lord Balfour.] Did I understand you to say that you would take away children from parents after they have been convicted? After the parents had been convicted; they must be first convicted of this act.

2874. Of what act?
   Of taking the children, dragging them about the streets, and singing.

2875. Do you mean that you think a conviction once for that would be sufficient to warrant you in taking away the children from the parents altogether?
   I think the magistrates would judge whether the parent was a professional vagrant who made a living by that means; if the magistrates were satisfied that that was the case then they would convict him.

2876. You would require to have it shown to be habitual?
   Yes, and I should have it done very carefully too.

2877. And do you think it possible that a certain class of people might resort to that means as a very ready means of getting rid of their children when they found them a nuisance?
   There are abuses in every law, of course; but I think if that were found to be the case, if those parents were punished severely it would stop that, probably.
   I think such a man ought to be punished; if he were punished in the first instance when you took away his children, if you punished him as well as taking away his children, that would probably stop it.

2878. To a certain class of men any punishment you could inflict would be a lighter thing than having to support a large family, over a period of years, at great expense to themselves?
   Yes, that is possible, of course; there are objections no doubt, but it seems to me such a degrading sight to see these children dragged about the street; you can never expect them to grow up good citizens.

2879. You have relieved at the present time, under the Paddington Board of Guardians, a considerable number of people who are getting small sums a week, ranging from 2s. to 3s.
   Yes, ranging from 2s. 6d. up to 12s. 6d.

2880. But you mentioned as an argument in favour of the superior economy of out-door relief, that they got less than you could afford to keep them for in the house, I understand.
   Yes; I should say so, and therefore that puts a pressure upon the woman to earn her bread, and with that small allowance she is induced to be industrious and self-supporting, and therefore she finds that small allowance sufficient.

2881. I want to put it in another way: do not you think that that allowance to people in that position is very unfair to people who are just above the border line, and have kept themselves above the Poor Law, but are yet taking the same class of work, chartering and house-cleaning.
   But this woman in any case would be a candidate for work of that kind.

2882. But if you are giving her 2s. or 3s. a week, cannot she afford to take it at a less rate, and thereby reduce the general rate?
   No; not if she has children to maintain.

2883. But the others have also children to maintain?
   But they have a bread-winner.

2884. Some widows so employed may be maintaining the same number of children without any help from the rates?
   There are some noble-minded women who have the power to maintain three or four children without coming on the rates.

2885. Is it not some objection to your system that if you subsidise women taking this class of work, you are enabling employers to get it for a less rate than if you did not pursue that practice?—No; I think 2s. a day for chartering, and 2s. 6d. a day for laundry work, are the regular fixed wages, and they do not ask them to work under that.

(70.)
2886. You think that the woman getting your 2 s. a week gets wages at the same rate as the other people?
Yes.

2887. Then is not that an additional argument for her not having that relief from the rates?
Supposing she has four children, how can she maintain them?

2888. Would not it be a better economy for you to take one or two of the children away from her, and put them into a school, or board them out and let her maintain the rest, rather than subsidise her with 2 s. or 3 s. a week out of doors?
No, I think not; and besides I am disposed to think that the home training is by far the most valuable training of all; and I am a strong advocate for leaving their children in the charge of the parent if she is industrious, respectable, and healthy.

2889. There are some people who think that the knowledge on the part of children that their parent has got relief from the parish is a piece of knowledge they do not easily forget, and that this out-door relief tends to breed a class of people who become dependent, in after years, upon the rates; is that your opinion?
I should not say so; that is not my experience at all. I think where a widow is left with a number of children to maintain there is generally sympathy and great kindness shown her.

2890. You are aware that many persons do hold the contrary opinion, and can bring facts of considerable importance to support their views?
Yes, I know there are a variety of views; I know some object to out-door relief under any circumstances whatever; they say it is an unwise thing; but for my part, I cannot conceive how the Poor Law could exist without that branch of it.

2891. You know that it is done in some metropolitan parishes?
I have heard that for a short time it was done.

2892. Do you not know that in the East End of London, in St. George’s, Stepney, and Whitechapel, there is almost no out door relief at this time?
But in cases of sickness they must have it.

2893. Do you not know that in those three parishes they have almost no out-door relief?
I have heard that; but I feel strongly that it would be impossible to conduct the Poor Law in a Christian and humane manner without it.

2894. Your opinion, which you have expressed here, has been formed from your own feeling, without inquiry into the experience of other places?
Not from my own feeling, my own experience.

2895. You have never looked into the experience of other places?
I have never gone into Whitechapel; I differ from those guardians in many ways.

2896. Because you differ from them that is no reason why you should not make inquiry, is it?
No, certainly not. I have heard that it is so, but I do not know.

2897. You, of course, agree with the opinion that until there is a condition of destitution, and the destitute person applying, the function of the Poor Law does not step in at all?
Certainly not; we deal solely and simply with destitution.

2898. Do you think the proportion of out-door relief in Paddington is showing any tendency to increase at the present time?
No, I do not.

2899. At
2890. At the same time I think you committed yourself to the opinion that outdoor relief was wise and proper and an economy to the ratepayers?
Yes, that is my distinct opinion.

2900. Under the strict way, you mean, in which you administer it in Paddington?
Yes.

2901. But not otherwise?
Certainly not. Indiscriminate outdoor relief is a sin, I say, an absolute crime; I cannot speak too strongly upon that; and therefore it requires the greatest possible care and caution and time; and the difficulty is to get guardians who have got the time and the disposition to devote themselves to that question; but, with proper investigation and good officers, I hold that the abuses can be very much less than they are under the in-door system. I have described what the law forces us to do with regard to in-door paupers. Now, in regard to out-relief, if the guardians made a mistake and gave an undeserving character outdoor relief, we should hear of it in a fortnight either through an anonymous letter or through the relieving officer or in some way, and I am not aware of any case in which the guardians have given relief for more than a week to an undeserving person. We never give outdoor relief on the first occasion for more than a week, and in the meantime we make inquiry; and I have never known a case where we have given it for more than a week and found that it was an undeserving person.

2902. Under those circumstances how often do you revise the list of those on your outdoor roll?
Every three months.

2903. By a committee?
There are three committees; each three form a quorum.

2904. And do the same cases come always before the same committee or do they vary?
We purposely vary them so as to bring fresh minds to bear upon the cases.

2905. But are there certain standing orders or rules drawn up by the committees so as to keep them to the same general principles.
We all act upon the same general principles; there are no rules drawn up, but the general principle is acted upon by all the guardians.

2906. The pivot upon which the safety of your system turns is, in your opinion, unvarying and constant supervision of the most efficient kind?
Yes, I think it is.

2907. Without that it would certainly fail?
I cannot speak too strongly upon my opposition to indiscriminate relief, and it would resolve itself into that if there were not that constant care exercised.

2908. Chairman.] I understand you to be in favour of a rule of indoor relief, as is shown by the administration of Paddington, where the indoor relief is much larger than the outdoor relief?
Certainly.

2909. But your view is that there must be a certain not inconsiderable number of exceptions in which it is better to deal with the cases by way of outdoor relief?
Yes, I think with regard to outdoor relief this must be considered, that when you are dealing with persons out of doors, you are in fact rewarding good conduct, because you relieve none out of doors who are not deserving persons and persons of good character, whereas indoors you relieve all sorts, and we all know very well who drifts into the workhouse.

2910. Could you explain what is the character of the cases in which you grant outdoor relief in Paddington?
The character of the temporary cases in the first instance would be cases of accident and sickness.

(70.) S 3 2911. Accident
2911. Accident and sickness to the head of the family, or to any one in the family, do you mean?
   Well, to any; we give an out-door medical order in the case of sickness to any one of the family.

2912. But with regard to other relief would it generally be confined to the head of the family?
   Yes.

2913. Are you guided, when a case of that kind comes before you, by the character of the applicant, or the circumstances of the applicant, or what are the governing reasons which make you discriminate the case as one for out-door relief rather than indoor relief?
   The circumstances always would be a factor in the question; the circumstances of the man, whether he was competent or able to take care of himself; we should first of all satisfy ourselves that he was not able to supply his family with the necessaries of life; and then with regard to the character; we should be extremely loth to break up a family and take that man into the workhouse, and break up the whole home, even if he were not altogether a very reputable character; but we should be very cautious; we should only give him relief just to enable him to tide over that difficulty, and only give it in kind too; we never give relief in money to a person who may possibly apply it to the public-house.

2914. You would probably pay considerable regard to the fact that he was usually in constant employment, and able to support the family, and likely to be in good employment again?
   Yes.

2915. And in a case where a man was not usually in good employment, and had not the means to maintain a family, probably you would be less willing to grant out-door relief?
   Yes.

2916. Perhaps I should be right in supposing that widows constitute a considerable proportion of these cases?
   They do.

2917. As to widows, do you require them to maintain one or two children if they are able-bodied?
   Two if they are thoroughly able-bodied, or sometimes three.

2918. And, therefore, your assistance is given for children over and above that number?
   Yes.

2919. Take the case of aged and infirm people; supposing that a man comes to you and applies for relief, who, perhaps, has never had poor relief before as yet; he is a hard-working man, and has had good wages all his life, but he has saved nothing, and at the age say of 70 finds himself destitute, how do you deal with such a case?
   Is he a single man.

2920. I will suppose a man and his wife; the man has become aged; he is no longer able to do work; he has been steady, honest, hard-working, never had relief before or assistance from anybody, but he has now nothing, having saved nothing whatever; he comes with his wife, who is in the same condition; how do you deal with that case?
   In such a case as that you describe we should most likely give him 6s. a week.

2921. Out-door relief?
   Yes.

2922. Do not you think the giving that man out-door relief operates as a distinct discouragement to the working classes to exercise thrift?
There is not the least doubt that the Poor Law, administered how you please, does that.

But is not the administration of the Poor Law in the particular manner in which it appears to be exercised in Paddington, in the particular case I have mentioned, likely to have as a direct consequence the discouragement of thrift?

No, I do not think that persons who come upon this out-door relief contemplated coming upon the Poor Law at all in their early life; they have lost their money and are driven to apply for relief from the rates.

Has it never occurred in your experience, as I know it does not infrequently occur in rural unions, that a man in that position says, "I have been a payer of rates all my life, and I think now I may take something out of them"?

That is often said.

Do you think it desirable to encourage that?

No, certainly not.

But does not the system you speak of encourage it?

But very often these cases we give out-door relief to are cases of persons who have been on clubs, and through misfortune lost their money.

My question related to a man who has not taken any steps to save, and not had any misfortune in life, but has simply spent all his earnings; in that case you would give out-door relief, I understand?

If I found he was a public-house man I should give him an order for the house.

My question assumed that he was a man of respectable character and simply from infirmity unable to work any more, and who having saved nothing was destitute; that would be a case where in Paddington they give out-door relief?

Yes; I think Canon Blackley's principle is the only cure you can have for that.

When you are considering the question of out-door relief, do you pay much attention to the fact whether the man has been in a club or has taken steps to endeavour to lay by for accident and old age?

We always give it the greatest consideration.

But you do not go the length of saying that if a man does not do that you will offer him the house?

No.

Do you think it would be objectionable as a rule to offer the house where a man has not taken reasonable care to save something?

I should not like to be a party to that.

Are there any other cases I have not mentioned where you would give out-door relief?

No, I do not think there are any other cases.

Have you any labour yard at Paddington?

We have only got a wood-shed at Paddington; we send our able-bodied labourers to Kensington; they have got a labour yard there.

Do you think the labour yard an advisable or necessary part of the Poor Law arrangements in London?

Yes; I do not see how you are to test them at all without that. We send every able-bodied man under 60 down to Kensington.

You are aware that there is a great objection to them, as being open to a vast amount of imposture; have you ever considered whether it is better to have a labour test house where able-bodied men may be put to work?

I should approve of that. I think it an excellent suggestion.

(70.)
You also mentioned that you were in favour of a larger system of emigration?
Yes.

Have you formed any notion of what that system would be, or how it would be carried on?
I have not drafted any particular plan, but I have attended a great many meetings with Lord Meath, and gone a good deal into the question; and it appears to me that if there is an excess of population, and the supply of labour greater than the demand, there is no other way of relieving that congestion unless you restore prosperity.

You have not considered probably the question as to whether these people could be sent in large numbers without very considerable expenditure upon the other side for their reception?
That, of course, there must be. I feel so strongly upon that question of emigration and the lack of employment in this metropolis, that I am sure something strong must be done. I do not pretend to dictate how it should be done, but I say you must reduce the number of persons competing for work.

You probably are aware that the kind of emigrants that would be sent out from this metropolis are, as a rule, very unsuited indeed to colonial life?
To meet that difficulty our board of guardians has proposed a labour colony, a farm in the country, to train men for agricultural pursuits before they are emigrated, and so far as that goes, I am in favour of it. I think that to send out raw recruits from the metropolis without any knowledge whatever of agricultural pursuits would be a very unwise thing; I think that they are utterly unsuited for life in the colonies; and, therefore, we propose to train them first; and then, after they are trained, send them out. I think something of that kind must be done.

You said that the impoverished condition of a part of the population of Paddington had been caused to some extent, you thought, by a large immigration of agricultural labourers; have you of your own observation seen any considerable number of agricultural labourers beyond what is ordinarily the case, during the last three or four years in Paddington?
I am not prepared to say that I have; I have met with a good many cases, but I am not prepared to draw any contrast, because I do not know what the case was three or four years ago; I am speaking of what I saw last winter.

Do you know whether there were many agricultural labourers then in Paddington?
Yes, there were some.

Lord Thring.] Will you tell me why you think that under existing circumstances emigration would reduce competition in London?
If you lessen the number you must reduce the competition.

But is that so. We have been told (in another Committee now sitting) over and over again here, that the competition in London is produced by a number of unskilled labourers being employed where formerly skilled labourers were employed. For instance, in tailoring we have been told that the prices have been reduced because, instead of unskilled workmen being employed to make a pair of trousers, three or four unskilled workmen are employed, only one skilled workman finishing. These unskilled you could not send abroad because they would not take them; therefore, emigration would only drain the upper stratum, not the lower stratum, which produces the great competition?
There is no doubt that if you reduce the number you must reduce the competition, even under the conditions you mention.

In the first place, I believe you are aware that when you drain the population it fills up very rapidly; it has a tendency to fill up?
Yes.
2945. But the point on which I have a great curiosity is this: we have been told over and over again here, as far as I understand it, that the great difficulty in London arises from the fact that labour now is distributed to such a large extent that each workman only makes one particular piece of the goods: the consequence is that five workmen make a particular table (I will take that now as an example) a great deal cheaper than one workman can, because, if you employed one workman he would require to be a skilled workman who would be employed in un-skilled work, whereas now the unskilled work is done by inferior workmen not capable of being sent abroad. It is not a question, therefore, of the number of people, but the fact that there is a great residuum of unskilled workmen who could not be emigrated, and yet do a great deal of the work that skilled workmen formerly did?

That is perfectly true, and the distress does exist amongst chiefly the unskilled men, no doubt; the mechanics and the more skilled men are not in the same distress.

2946. We are told no distress at all; I mean practically?
I should say that is so.

2947. Then I wish to put it to you that the class we should most wish to get rid of we cannot get rid of by emigration?
Why?

2948. Because they are of no use as emigrants?
But I should propose this labour colony to instruct them or prepare them for emigration. If they do not want to work you can do nothing with them; if a man is in earnest and wants to earn his bread honestly he will soon fall into the way and learn enough to become a useful emigrant when he gets abroad.

2949. We have been told over and over again that there are thousands and thousands in the East-end who are unskilled workmen; they are not, as I understand, altogether unwilling to work, but they are the lowest class of workmen, and are gradually degrading the work which was formerly done by skilled labour; now, do you propose, by labour farms, to decrease that number of the unskilled labourers?
We have got no thought of anything outside our own parish; we feel that in the parish of Paddington there are a certain number of men anxious and willing to work, who, with a little training, might become suitable to emigrate.

2950. Earl Spencer.] Would not a good many of those men be unfitted for farm work?
At present they are.

2951. But would they not remain so?
No; I have met with a good many men who would be fit for it, because they are anxious to work.

2952. But are they physically strong enough?
Yes.

2953. Lord Thring.] I understand you to admit that as regards the residuum whom I am describing to you, emigration would not be applicable to them?
No, I should think it would not.

2954. Lord Balfour.] I think you were a member of the Special Committee which organised work for the unemployed in the distress last winter?
Yes, I was one of the most active members.

2955. Have you followed the unemployed who were under you to see what became of them on the turn of the stream?
We said to those men, we employ you at these moderate wages (4 d. an hour) till you find work; and we found by degrees that the men were absorbed in other employments. When a man found another job of more permanent work, he was allowed to go without any difficulty; and most of the men are now employed in that way.
2956. But are you keeping any record of them, so as to see whether the same men come back next winter?

No, we are not doing that; but we have a record of every single name, and the address of every man that we recommended for employment; and therefore that record is in existence; and if another year this same thing were done, we should be able to refer to the man's character, and the nature of the work, and see how he acquitted himself upon this ground that we employed him upon.

2957. Had you much difficulty with the men themselves?

None at all; I was surprised at the facility with which they dropped into the employment; painters and shoemakers and all sorts of men of that sort; they worked with a good will.

2958. Some of them were painters, were they?

Yes, a good many of them.

2959. And bricklayers?

Yes, bricklayers' labourers.

2960. It would be very desirable to see whether those men have learnt a lesson from their hard circumstances of last winter and are inclined to be thrifty this year, so that, unless they meet with some accident or mishap, they do not come back another year; do not you think, yourself, it would tend to make your work of less value than we hope it is, if the same men were to come back to you next winter?

Decidedly; in point of fact, I feel so strongly about it, that I said to the committee that I should very much hesitate about sitting again another year on that committee; because this year we have got great kudos for what we have done, I think undeservedly, because we found a man in our midst, Mr. Beachcroft, who took the responsibility of hiring 20 acres of ground to make a recreation ground to employ these men, and we sent them forward to this ground, and all the people were employed by this gentleman; we only sent men of deserving character. But another year we should not have a recreation ground, and therefore I should very much hesitate in creating work; creating work on purpose to employ unemployed men seems to me as bad as out-door relief.

2961. You would not be in favour of continuing that experiment unless absolutely driven to it by stress of circumstances?

I certainly should not. The committee is rather against me in that respect; but in my opinion it would not be wise to establish such a system another year.

2962. Chairman.] If you had such a system regularly, would not the result necessarily be that painters, carpenters, and bricklayers would spend all their wages in the summer months, looking to the certainty of finding work to keep them alive in the winter?

I do think it would.

2963. Were these people in the employment of Mr. Beachcroft, all those sent by the board of guardians?

No; by the committee for helping the unemployed.

2964. And paid by him?

Yes, and paid by him.

2965. So that as a board of guardians, had you anything to do with it?

Absolutely nothing.

2966. It was entirely charitable organization?

 Entirely; a committee appointed by the inhabitants of Paddington for the purpose of finding employment for these men.

2967. And it was through Mr. Beachcroft's assistance that the charitable organization found work for these men?

Yes; we paid Mr. Beachcroft a thousand pounds to assist in employing these men; he advanced himself the balance required.

2968. So
2968. So that in point of fact it was all raised by charitable subscription? Entirely. I am glad your Lordship asked that question; the board of guardians had nothing whatever to do with it.

2969. Earl of Aberdeen.] As to emigration to Canada, last week I saw 200 boys of Dr. Barnardo’s, in very good order, sent out from Easton, for whom I was told places had been found, or would be found before they landed in Canada; is it not the case that Dr. Barnardo has sent out 2,000 that way altogether?

Yes, Dr. Barnardo has sent off 600 this year.

2970. Do we understand that while on the one hand you recognise that much harm has been done, and prejudice has been created in Canada by shipping off people without training and proper equipment, on the other hand, you think that, properly arranged, the sending of emigrants would not be objected to?

From the very best authority I can get, that is my opinion; that it is entirely a question of the qualifications of the persons sent out. Much harm has been done by indiscernible men who have sent out shiploads of people who got drunk on the road and were perfectly unfit to earn their bread anywhere. There are in England a large number of people who will not work, and would not—if you gave it to them to-morrow.

2971. The experiment in Dr. Barnardo’s case was satisfactory because the boys he has sent out have been for the most part boys in destitute circumstances before they were under his management?

Yes, they have every one been destitute; but they have undergone a course of training in practical work.

2972. Earl Spencer.] In regard to Mr. Beachcroft’s efforts, and the assistance you have given him, was the organisation of which you were a member the same as the Charity Organisation, or was it a separate thing?

Nothing whatever to do with it.

2973. But there is a Charity Organisation in the parish?

Yes, but I have nothing to do with it.

2974. But it does act, notwithstanding your objection to it, independently of you?

Entirely independent of me.

2975. And has been acting for a considerable time?

Yes.

2976. And does it, do you suppose, relieve a good many cases?

That I cannot say; I do not know anything about them; I do not approve of their system. I sat upon their committee for 15 months, and totally disapprove of their action.

2977. But you know, perhaps, whether they relieve any number of cases?

I believe very few, as far as my own personal experience goes. I do not choose to be responsible for that.

2978. Is your objection general to the Charity Organisation Society, or does it only apply to the particular people who manage that branch?

It is a general objection; I do not like the mode of getting information, and condemning people upon hearsay evidence.

2979. Earl of Aberdeen.] You are aware that the per-centagie of pauperism per thousand of population in Paddington is one of the lowest of any district in London?

I have understood that.

2980. Eleven per thousand?

Eleven per thousand.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next,

Twelve o’clock.
Die Jovis, 7o Junii, 1888.
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Miss Louisa Twining, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

2981. Earl of Aberdeen.] I believe you for a very long time have paid great attention to matters connected with the administration of the Poor Law? Yes; I have been for the greater part of my life, I think, visiting workhouses, and I gave evidence before the Poor Law Committee of the House of Commons Committee in 1861.

2982. And you have written upon various branches of the subject in magazines and otherwise? Yes, I have, for some years now. My first visit to a workhouse was in 1853. Since that time I have seen a good many in the country and in London.

2983. You are a Poor Law guardian, I think? Yes.

2984. Where? At Kensington; I have been four years a guardian at Kensington.

2985. Were you at any previous time a guardian? No; this is my first election. I was asked to be a guardian in Holborn (at that time I lived in the Holborn district), but I did not feel that I could undertake that work.

2986. In the course of your experience have you come across difficulties in the administration of workhouses in connection with the want of restriction of liberty on the part of paupers coming in and out? Very much indeed; I think that is one of the great evils and grievances that we have to complain of.

2987. The class known as ins and outs? Yes, and the able-bodied. Of course it is quite a different thing from the case of the aged and the permanent inmates.

2988. Do you think that some kind of discrimination and classification would be practicable to meet that difficulty? We have very good classification at Kensington. I do not think that has anything to do with it. I think it is the power of discharge that is so exceedingly fatal in regard to that class; it is a great encouragement to them to make the workhouse their home, the exceeding facility for going in and out. I have information from some of the most experienced masters of workhouses in London, and I may say that they entirely agree with me, that the powers of detention...
detention should be much greater, and the times much longer. You are perhaps aware what the present powers of discharge are: 24 hours' notice for the first discharge; then, if more than once discharged in a month, 48 hours; and if more than twice in two months, 72 hours. We have cases of people who go in and out 15 times in three months, 20 times in one year, 32 times in one year. and so on; but if I might speak of the great evil that I think is connected with that, it is in the case of those who have children in the schools.

2989. I was going to ask that question; perhaps you would state the effect of this system with regard to children?

There are parents who are in and out constantly, and have children in the schools, or in our temporary school, where they go for a fortnight on their way to the permanent school; and it is impossible to move the children to the permanent schools, where they would have a regular course of education, on account of the constant movements of the parents; every time the mother wishes to take her discharge, the child has to be sent for from the country and brought to her.

2990. That is, if the mother demands it?

But we are not allowed to let the parents go out without the children; they are obliged to take them with them when they go out.

2991. You mean that if a workhouse child is placed in the school, and the parent of that child, being an inmate, demands his discharge, it is necessary that the child should be brought away from the school?

We must make the parent take the child with him; you may imagine what the result is. I can state one or two cases of the terrible evil of it. One woman who has been five years in our workhouse went out 11 times in the year, and each time the child had to be sent up from the school. They go out with other people, they go to the most terrible places, are guilty of most immoral practices, stay two or three days, just as long as they can manage to live or beg, and then come back, and the child goes back again to the school, and it is utterly impossible to attempt to do anything with those children.

2992. Are you speaking of district schools?

This is a temporary school we have, to avoid sending them to our large district schools; everyone goes for a fortnight to a temporary school, and many children are at that school for months or longer, because they cannot be sent to the district schools.

2993. It operates in the same way, I suppose, in the case of the district schools?

Yes, the effect upon the children is terrible, and it is most disheartening to the teachers; they feel that it is impossible to produce any good effect upon these children.

2994. Can you give any other example?

Another board of guardians said that a man was determined his children should not go to the school, and he went out 40 times in the year, I think, and each time he gave notice for fresh discharge, which entirely defeated the plan of the guardians for educating those children.

2995. Do you know where that occurred?

I think at Islington.

2996. Is it a case within your own knowledge?

It was a printed statement of the guardians in their report, not within my personal knowledge.

2997. With regard to the effect of the same system upon the young women who come in with infants, have you anything to state about that?

One guardian, Mr. Bousfield, now a member of the School Board, published a paper as long ago as 1880, concerning this point, especially desiring further powers of detention for these girls. I am not aware that anything has been done.

2998. In
2908. In your experience is the effect of the existence of the right of admission to the workhouse at all times demoralising in the case of the class of whom you are speaking?

Most demoralising; and in the case of these girls, if they choose so to arrange it, they can come straight to the infirmary without even passing through the comparative stigma of the workhouse, which, I think, some of them may feel.

2909. You are speaking of young women with illegitimate children?

Yes.

3000. Chairman.] May I ask what you mean by the right of admission at all times?

They have nothing to do but come in a state of serious illness to the gate, and they must be taken in.

3001. Earl of Aberdeen.} Would you suggest any alteration?

I think there might be greater deterrent measures in many ways, and certainly in the power of detention over these girls. The efforts of the relieving officers and the ladies to assist and to prove facts, which are very important, and are exceedingly disliked by the girls themselves, are often entirely defeated; they leave at the end of a fortnight or three weeks, and there is no power to make out anything about them; they can defeat all your endeavours if they choose to leave, and they are not obliged to go into the workhouse on their passing out again. It is a delightful, excellent hospital, with the best nurses and accommodation and food. It is not in the workhouse, as I was saying, but in the infirmary.

3002. Of course you would be in favour of making the infirmary as excellent as possible?

Quite so.

3003. But you wish for some greater power of control in these cases?

Yes; many of us think it would be better if those wards were in the workhouse than in the infirmary.

3004. The lying-in wards you mean?

Yes; but then again we have trained nurses and probationers training in those particular wards, and it is exceedingly important that they should be under a trained matron and her supervision; so you see how difficult the question is.

3005. You mentioned that there was a system of classification at Kensington; do you refer to any special system peculiar to Kensington, or to the general rule?

Do you mean the ordinary workhouse or the infirmary?

3006. I refer to the general administration of the guardians?

I think it is left very much to the individual boards of guardians, and it depends very much upon the buildings themselves as to whether classification is possible. We have done our utmost to separate the different classes as far as possible in Kensington over and above the Poor Law orders. We do keep the aged and infirm and the able-bodied separate; the old couples are kept quite separate. We have 17 rooms for old couples; I think we make every arrangement we can.

3007. Chairman.] But all those arrangements, I believe, are prescribed by the orders of the Poor Law Board?

Yes, but very few carry out the orders for the old people.

3008. You mean married people?

Yes.

3009. But the regulations as to the separation of able-bodied and infirm people are in the orders?

Yes; there is no separation of characters.

(70.)
3010. Earl of *Aberdeen.*] Has anything in that respect been attempted at Kensington?
No, I think not.

3011. It is possible, I presume?
Not with regard to the younger women and the able-bodied; I think it would be exceedingly difficult to make distinctions.

3012. Upon the question of infirmaries, I think you have some alterations to suggest with regard to the medical practice which you have advocated in your articles.
Twenty-seven years ago I urged the same thing, that we require more medical inspection and visiting in our infirmaries. We have over 600 sick at Kensington, so that it is as large nearly as one of our largest London hospitals, and we have a medical superintendent and his assistant, and our medical superintendent has urged for some years that he might be allowed to bring in other medical men for the sake of the study.

3013. Something of the same kind as is adopted in the general hospitals, I presume, you mean?
Yes, perhaps not so much as students, but medical practitioners who have already gone through their student course, if the students were objected to. The other day a young hospital doctor was taken through one of our infirmaries, and he examined the cases, and he said there were some he would give anything to have the opportunity of studying; cases they never see in general hospitals; the long cases and the chronic cases, that really they have no opportunity of studying, because they all go to the workhouses, and they last for years. It would improve our nurses; it would let daylight in. The poor themselves would like it. I am quite sure, because it is impossible that two medical men could look after 600 patients, and we have several severe cases now, and frequent operations.

3014. I think you have paid attention to the question of workhouse hospital management for many years?
Yes, I have been very much interested in it. Twenty-five years ago there was an estimate made that there were 60,000 incurables from three diseases alone who could not be received into the voluntary hospitals, and I do not know where else they can go but to the Poor Law infirmaries. Cottage hospitals, county infirmaries, never take cases that last for years; there is no other hospital for incurables except our Poor Law infirmaries, and I do think there is great need of further improvement and inspection in the country ones. We have two medical inspectors in London, where they are really hospitals, and where you may say they hardly require this inspection; in the country there is no medical inspection whatever.

3015. Chairman.] What do you mean precisely by medical inspection; do you mean inspection by inspectors appointed by the Poor Law?
Yes. Of course there are medical men appointed to every workhouse, but that, I think, is quite a different thing.

3016. You mean inspectors specially appointed who should go round and inspect the infirmaries from time to time in all workhouses in the kingdom?
Yes, and I am most anxious that they should appoint a woman to do that work; I think it is most important that a woman should examine into the work of the nurses in a way which I venture to think would be a great improvement upon the present plan. We have now belonging to our association for introducing trained nurses into workhouse infirmaries, about 100 nurses, and we get a great deal of information from them, and we find it is sometimes terribly uphill work for them; there is nobody to approve of their work, to inspect it, to encourage them, and there is a great jealousy on the part of the workhouse matron very often, because the nurse knows more than she does. She is quite afraid to ask for the most necessary appliances. We find that there are sometimes no screens for the beds, no thermometers or appliances for the sick; and whenever we send a nurse trained in a hospital infirmary for a whole year you may sup-
pose it is extremely trying for her to have to work under such difficulties as those.

3017. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have you found in connection with this association that the old system of pauper nurses is continued to a great extent outside London?

To a great extent outside the metropolitan infirmaries. We not only send trained nurses, but we can get in probationers at very little cost to the rates to take the place of these pauper women; and some of our nurses say that the immorality, the conversation, and the behaviour of the pauper helps is beyond what they can endure.

3018. Do you find that the guardians generally are ready to co-operate with your society?

They are increasingly asking for more nurses than we can supply now.

3019. I suppose it is inevitable that even if the guardians were in favour of your system, very often an ignorant matron, or even master, would be little disposed to look with favour on a new system?

That is very much the case. I believe it is improving; but we get lady visitors to encourage them wherever we can. Of course they have no power to ask for things. Where we get lady guardians our work is made much more easy, because they have power to ask; but it is an exceedingly invidious thing for the nurse, and also for the doctor, to ask for additional cost to be incurred, when things have gone on for years without anything of the kind.

3020. I understand that you advocate the extension of a system of lady inspectors generally in connection with workhouse administration?

I do most earnestly desire it; I think it is our one great object just now. When Mrs. Nassau Senior was appointed in 1874, I had the honour of being consulted about her appointment by the then President of the Local Government Board, and I think there could have been no greater success than that appointment; I think it has made a complete change about all the ideas of the treatment of children in the schools; and I am sure it is quite as important for the sick. We have had to remove some nurses from the impossible conditions and unsanitary rooms. One nurse had to cook her own ration in the same saucepan in which she had also to cook things for the sick; very often they had to do the cooking in the wards or in their own little sitting rooms, and, in fact, we have had to remove those who could not put up with the difficulties. I suppose that the women are afraid to ask the inspectors when they go round, and I am afraid if the master goes round with the inspector (and I suppose it is very often the case that the officials go round), the nurses have not courage to state their grievances and their wants, as they would do to a woman.

3021. Speaking generally, it is obvious, is it not, that there must be many matters of domestic economy in which a lady would usually have facilities for ascertaining the state of matters better than a man?

A woman used to hospital management, herself a trained nurse, would be able to report entirely upon these nurses all over England. Our own committee visit wherever we possibly can, but then we have no authority to ask for anything from the guardians, and if they thought we were making great demands it might prejudice them very much against our work.

3022. Going to another point, have you any opinion to offer upon the question of out-door relief as distinguished from in-door relief?

Yes, I have a strong opinion about it; I do not feel quite so competent to speak to that, because I have had chiefly to do with it only since I have been a guardian, but my own opinion is that it is most undesirable, especially in rich parishes, that there should be out-door relief; it leads to the greatest confusion of opinions. The charitable relief in Kensington, I am perfectly sure, would meet all the deserving cases of out-door relief if there were not this idea that they may just as well come to us to ask for it; they get a shilling or two from the church or the chapel, or district visitors, and then they come to us to supplement it; I think that it checks private charity, besides demoralising the poor.
3023. Have you any co-operation in Kensington between the Poor Law guardians and charitable agencies?
Yes, we always ascertain what is done by the charitable agencies, and we are in close connection with the Charity Organisation Society, and refer cases to them.

3024. If an applicant for Poor Law relief is found to be deserving, as well as needy, but the case is not a case which the Poor Law can properly relieve, is such a case sent on to some charitable society?
Yes, I think so; they are all known to the district visitors and clergy in the parish of Kensington; but there are a great many cases of people, even 80 and 90 years of age, who ought to be helped, and I think it exceedingly hard that they should come upon the poor rates in their old age, and I believe if it were not for this idea that we have a bottomless purse to dip into, they would be amply relieved.

3025. You mean that there is such an idea on the part of the public?
Yes, and the poor themselves. Then I think it is a great hardship to the poor, this immense difference of administration throughout London. I do not wish to give any opinion of the administration of the Poor Law in the country, because I am not so well acquainted with that, and I think with the close inspection in country places it may be more easy to give out-door relief fairly in individual cases; but I do think that in London it is a great hardship to have liberal out-door relief given in one parish, and absolutely none in another; it creates a feeling of injustice in the minds of the poor, and they are perfectly unable to judge as to any reason for the distinction; I cannot see why it is allowed.

3026. Do you find that the more respectable classes of the poor have a greater aversion to receiving relief from the rates than from charitable sources?
I do not think there is any difference in their minds with regard to out-door relief; I do not think they understand the difference at all.

3027. There is no reason, is there, why there should be anything degrading in receiving Poor Law relief, as compared with charitable relief?
I think we must maintain the distinction between poverty and pauperism; it would be an evil day for us when we began to confound those two.

3028. Chairman.] Is it your own opinion that it is not more demoralising to a poor man to obtain relief from the rates than to obtain it from charity?
It is more so; the demoralising does not limit itself to those who actually receive it, it extends to the whole family; they see no reason why their relations should not be supported by the out-door relief, and save their giving anything to them if they can help it.

3029. Earl of Aberdeen.] The degradation arises, does it not, from the circumstances and the surroundings, rather than from any actual disgrace in the case of a person who, through no fault, is destitute?
I think my opinion would be, that if the people were really absolutely destitute through no fault of their own (but we do not know how far to go back for that, because the fault may have been begun in early life by want of thrift, which has been encouraged by the idea that there is the Poor Law to fall back upon at the last), there are very few cases that would not be helped by the enormous charities, or by a number of their own friends or relations.

3030. Whatever the opinion as to that may be, I gather that your experience decidedly is that the receipt of relief in either form is demoralising?
Entirely.

3031. Chairman.] You mentioned the great evils which arise from the coming in and going out, at short intervals, of paupers; have you at all considered to what extent additional means of detention would be advisable?
I have a pamphlet of General Lynedoch Gardiner, who was for 15 years vice-chairman of Marylebone, and who published a pamphlet about it some years ago, I think it was before the last addition, prolonging the notice to 72 hours;
but I have been speaking to an experienced London master, and he urges that a week should be the shortest time to ask, and then a month, and then three months. We are quite of opinion that if those who live in the workhouse, and going in and out (but they never do work, there they are for years), were prevented, especially those who have children connected with them, from going out oftener than once in three months, it would have a very deterrent effect. And then may I say again as to the pensioners, the evil effects of that? I have mentioned in my article, pensioners with ample to live upon out of doors, who make their home in the workhouse.

3032. What kind of pensioners?
We have army pensioners; the number is greatly increasing in the London workhouses. They could live out of doors, but they prefer to be in the workhouse; they go out to receive their pension, and we have most urgently requested the War Office to make it oftener than three months; the temptation which results from receiving the large sum is so extremely great. Of course we claim the small sums that we can claim; but they go out for two or three days, and they have their friends whom they join, and they spend pounds.

3033. You find that they very frequently go out and spend the whole amount they receive in drink, and then come back to the workhouse, and repeat the operation on the next occasion?
Yes, and the temptation is much greater because of the larger sum.

3034. But now if such a system as you propose were established, would it not be necessary to leave a full discretion to the board of guardians to let out any particular persons at shorter periods where they thought it advisable?
For looking for work, you mean? I think there would be no difficulty about that.

3035. Or for any other reason; because, if you were to lay down an absolute rule, very grievous hardship might be inflicted upon individuals who do not belong to the in-and-out class?
The ins and outs seem to me so totally different from the more permanent inmates.

3036. I can understand that your system might be applied to the class which we will term the in-and-out class; but in every workhouse there must be a certain number of persons (certainly in the country there are) who do not belong to the in-and-out class; and would it not be a very grievous hardship to say that such a man must be kept in the workhouse for the full period prescribed?
We must give discretion. We have a great many coming in for the winter and going out again for the summer months, and I think the master knows who they are, and there is no difficulty about allowing them out for a day to look after work, any who are in the least likely to get it; but of course they are quite a different class.

3037. I think a good deal of your reason for wishing to detain this class of paupers had reference to children?
I think that is the most important class, in which it affects the children.

3038. Have you considered whether it would be justifiable on general principles to lay hands, as it were, upon the children of a certain class of people, and send them to the schools to be permanently supported by the rates, so that the children of people of worthless characters would get an education at the expense of the State, as compared with the children of better-behaved people, who would have to be supported by their own parents?
All classes dislike to have their children taken from them.

3039. Yes; but what I mean is this. Has it ever occurred to you that it is a very serious burden for the State to undertake, by such means as you indicate, to draw within the net of State support a large number of children who happen to be the children of ill-behaved parents?
I think everybody engaged in this work feels the difficulty of that. We had a large meeting yesterday of guardians connected with the Association for Be-
friend Young Servants and Workhouse Girls, and fully discussed the subject there, and we do feel the difficulties; but we think that further powers of detention in the workhouse would check a great deal of the evil with the children in the first instance, and that there might be conditions, if we are to educate them and maintain them, that the parents must consent to certain conditions much more stringent than they do now.

3040. The real object of my question is to ascertain whether you do not see some serious objection in relieving parents from the responsibility of maintaining and taking care of their own children, because those parents are not discharging their own duty, in fact?

Of course it is a great difficulty; everybody feels it; but it will be met in some such way, I think, as in the industrial schools. And every other country seems to have met the worst evil of all; that is, our losing all control over them at the age of 15 or 16.

3041. Criminal children are, of course, in a different class; they can be taken from their parents and placed in an institution; but if we are to extend that to children who are not criminal, and whose parents are not criminal but merely ill-to-do people, will not that lead us very far indeed?

I am afraid that they may be called quite a semi-criminal class; I think there is the merest border line of distinction between the two classes, those who treat their children in this way and the criminals.

3042. With regard to the infirmary, I understood you to say that at your infirmary paupers may obtain admission without going through the workhouse?

Yes, if it is an urgent case, and the doctors think they must not be required to go through the receiving wards of the workhouse.

3043. It is only to urgent cases that that would apply?

Yes.

3044. Has it occurred to you that, as you make the infirmaries more and more complete as hospitals, if you give easy admission to them, you, in point of fact, offer to the whole population hospital support at the expense of the State?

Yes, that is what we do now.

3045. But still, it has not come quite to that point yet, because it is supposed that there is some objection on the part of respectable people to go into any institution connected with the workhouse; do not you see any objection to extending the system of infirmaries, so as to make them regarded as places to which any people may resort without the evils consequent on having accepted State relief; people who would be now ashamed to resort to them?

I am afraid that that feeling will diminish whatever we may do to check it, and more especially as now our voluntary hospitals are quite insufficient for our population.

3046. Then, would you go the length of saying that it would be in principle unobjectionable if infirmaries were provided for the whole population at the expense of the State?

I should like to see the voluntary hospitals enforce some system of payment according to the means of the person applying for admission, and that would divide the two classes.

3047. But supposing no system of payment was enforced in the infirmary, would it not necessarily result that everyone would go to the infirmary?

I think not; it would be in the power of the hospitals and the infirmaries, I believe, to ascertain those who were able to pay.

3048. But you certainly think that it would be necessary to have stringent regulations to, as far as possible, prevent people from resorting to the infirmaries who could pay something for their own medical relief?

Yes; we are at this moment considering the question in our infirmary at Kensington whether more could be done to treat people out of doors. I think
think there is a tendency to bring everybody in-doors; at the same time, the population is enormously increasing, and the sick must be provided for, certainly, somewhere, but I think the connection of the infirmary with the workhouse is desirable, as far as we can keep it up.

3049. I think I am quite right in gathering it to be your opinion that one of the great difficulties in dealing with those who make use of a workhouse is in regard to the lying-in ward, and in that case, therefore, you would advocate some stringent regulations as to detention?

Most certainly; I think that is the most important point of all.

3050. Probably you think that that particular class might be dealt with much more stringently than any other class?

Much more.

3051. Do you think that such regulations would check that considerably?

I am inclined to think that it would. I think the entire freedom is the most welcome part of the relief to that class of persons; there is no hold upon the parents, and they give us just what information they like, or no information at all, and they come and go just as it suits their convenience. We are going to have a conference of the lady guardians from all over England, I hope, next week, and we are going to make that our special subject of discussion. I do think it is one that women may take up, and I am very anxious to hear what those from the country think about it; we think that the liberty is most injurious, and fruitful of mischief.

3052. As to the trained nurses, you said that the expense was not great; have you not found an objection in some boards of guardians to trained nurses as being too expensive?

No, on the contrary, some have asked us for a nurse at 20 l. a year, and they never give less to any nurse, trained or untrained, except in some very miserable unions; and when we have told them that when they require midwifery besides, we cannot send them under 25 l., many boards have gladly given that sum to have a thoroughly competent and trained woman.

3053. Have you any experience with regard to nurses who are sent to poor people not in the workhouse?

Visiting in their own homes, district nurses, do you mean?

3054. Yes?

Yes, we have an excellent branch at Kensington, which we believe keeps a good many out from the infirmary; they nurse them in their own homes without sending them to hospitals or infirmaries.

3055. Did you ever find that objections were made that the class of nurses you send are too expensive for these homes, and altogether above the class that should be sent to attend on these people.

We find that the higher the class of nurse, the better she does the work.

3056. I think I may infer from what you said, and also from statistics which I have here before me, that the administration in Kensington is strict as regards out-door relief?

Yes.

3057. I see here that the ratio per thousand to the population on the day to which this return refers was only two per cent. of paupers receiving out-door relief; the figure for the whole of London being 10·9. It follows, therefore, that you are strict?

Yes; still not to be compared to St. George's in the East or Whitechapel. I was talking to Mr. Vallance about Whitechapel yesterday, and I believe practically they give none.

3058. Do you know whether of late years the administration of out-door relief has been made more strict in Kensington?

I think it has been gradually advancing towards that; the majority of us are quite in favour of limiting it as much as possible.
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3059. And
3059. And you have found that it tends to diminish pauperism in the union, have you not?

There is no question about it. If you would hear Mr. Vallance's statistics for Whitechapel, it is most remarkable to find how it has diminished.

3060. Can you tell us whether you have any special rules as to dealing with widows with children?

Yes; we take their children to the district schools in lieu of out-door relief. Some people object to that, but on the whole we have come to the conclusion that it is a safe plan and the best plan.

3061. Do you take all children above the number of two into the schools?

Never more than two.

3062. But suppose a widow happens to have six or seven children, what is done then?

I think we have taken three, but I believe never a larger proportion than that.

3063. Then where there were more, would you give the widow an order for the house?

She always stays outside, I think.

3064. I am supposing the case of a widow who is left with seven small children, and who is able to work, and could reasonably support two; what course do you pursue with regard to the other five.

I am not aware that we have ever taken more than two, not more than three certainly, out of one family. If there was any idea of bad character, or drink, of course we should insist upon the house; we should give nothing at all out of doors in such a case.

3065. Have you found much objection on the part of widows to that system?

Hardly at all; they go down to visit their children at Banstead, and I think they are thoroughly satisfied. Might I say about the infirmaries, that we do feel very strongly the necessity, and I believe many official persons feel the same, of the separation where possible of the infirmaries from the workhouses as to management. They really are managed on very different plans. The officials of workhouses, are, generally speaking, of an inferior class to the trained matron, who is a lady now in almost all instances; and where that matron is placed under the workhouse master and matron, exceeding difficulties do arise.

We were most anxious when the Hampstead Infirmary was opened last year (I think nearly 200 patients they have) that it should be entirely separated. At present the London infirmaries, and Manchester and Leeds, are the only ones entirely separate from the workhouses. They have absolutely no contact. There is a medical superintendent, a matron, and a steward, and they are entirely apart from the authority of the master and matron; but in cases where that contact exists the friction is often very great and very trying indeed, and I cannot see why, when the numbers amount to 200 or over, they should not be separate establishments. They have to ask the officials for the linen and the food; every point where they come into contact becomes a friction and a difficulty, and those who have not watched the management cannot tell the trial it is, and I believe some of the Local Government Board officers see that, and are anxious that our association should press this subject. It appeared to us that the Local Government Board was the medium that might make this suggestion; and if it is so necessary and desirable in the metropolitan district, we cannot see why it should not be in the great towns all over England.

3066. Earl of Strafford.] I think you are very much in favour of lady Poor Law inspectors?

I am.

3067. Were you associated with Mrs. Nassau Senior in any way, either officially or confidentially, during the time that she was a lady inspector?

Confidentially; I visited many schools with her, and at that time I had a home for workhouse girls.

3068. Were
3068. Were her duties confined to inspecting schools, or had she authority to go into the infirmaries of workhouses, and report upon the condition of things there?

The schools entirely for her year of office; then her health broke down. I believe at the end of that year it was decided that she was to be appointed to the general inspection of workhouses, but before that time arrived, her health broke down and she died.

3069. And since Mrs. Nassau Senior's death, no lady inspector has taken her place till Miss Mason became an inspector under the Poor Law Board?

Miss Mason is for the boarding-out only. We do hope that it may be carried on again as it was in Mrs. Nassau Senior's time.

3070. You wish the lady inspectors to perform very much the duties with regard to women and children that the male inspectors do now; to report to the Poor Law authorities and the guardians?

Yes, with regard to the clothing, the management, and domestic economy.

3071. Have you thought what number would be required to be able to carry out the work efficiently?

Mrs. Nassau Senior was the only one, and the work was too much for her; Miss Mason is only one for the boarding-out all over England. I think as far as the infirmaries are concerned, we should be satisfied if one lady were appointed to begin with.

3072. For all England?

For all England, in the country infirmaries; of course, nothing in London would be required.

3073. And do you think that these ladies could act independently of the male officials, and could report independently to the Poor Law authorities, without having any connection with the male inspectors?

Would not that be exactly Mrs. Nassau Senior's case?

3074. But she was only an inspector in regard to the schools, nothing in regard to the internal economy of the workhouses?

Would that make any difference? She reported upon the clothing and the food, and the sanitary arrangements in every respect.

3075. You do not think there will be any difficulty in carrying out, on a rather more extended scale, the work that Mrs. Nassau Senior performed with regard to schools?

Not the slightest. I do not think the present gentlemen (I do not mean to blame them in the least) could inspect our nurses' work with regard to the sick, especially the women in the lying-in wards, and the domestic economy, which is now entirely in the hands of the one matron.

3076. And you think it would give confidence to the matron of a workhouse if she felt she could report to and get assistance from a lady inspector, instead of having to report to a male inspector.

The good ones would welcome it, I am sure; the others do not welcome lady guardians or anybody, but the good ones would, and Mrs. Nassau Senior was beloved and respected and looked up to by, I believe, every authority she came in contact with.

3077. And I gather from you that it would be a great comfort to the women and children, and a support to the matron's authority in the workhouse, to feel she could refer to a lady inspector instead of to a male inspector?

That is really one chief point of my examination.

3078. I fancy you are in favour of boarding out children?

Very much indeed, the very few that it is possible to board out. I think the public hardly understand the exceedingly small proportion that you can take. Out of our 600 at Banstead there are exceedingly few that are able to be boarded out; and I was told the other day, at Lambeth, in the large Norwood schools there were not more than 30 children who were capable of being boarded (70.)
out, because they must be deserted or orphans, and the age is so limited. I should like to say a word of my exceeding desire to see cottage homes extended, which are available for older girls.

3070. Have you ever visited any of the homes where pauper children have been boarded out, and seen the houses?

No.

3080. But from what you believe, and have heard, are they well cared for there?

Well cared for, and Miss Mason's work is most thorough, and I should like to see it extended to all possible cases. But still schools must exist for the large proportion who are quite ineligible for boarding out; for those who can be boarded out I think the plan is most excellent, but I should like to see smaller ones instead of the very large schools, especially for girls, and that might be adopted much more generally than at present. Then, if we might see ladies and gentlemen at the head of the district schools; I hope that is an increasing practice; we want a higher tone in all our Poor Law officers, and that would work immense reform amongst the children.

3081. Earl of Onslow.] Have you got any arrangement with the Charity Organisation Society for relief of cases which you think ought not to be dealt with by the guardians in Kensington?

Yes, we refer all the possible cases to them; we generally have a lady in attendance on our weekly meetings from the Charity Organisation Society, who takes over all the cases requiring situations, and help that we cannot give.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. James Henry Allen, having been called in; is Examined as follows:

3082. Chairman.] You are an ex-officio Guardian of St. Pancras, and Chairman of the Out-Relief and Casual Wards Committees of that union.

I am.

3083. Have you been so for some time?

Six years.

3084. In your union is the administration a strict one as regards in-door and out-door relief; I mean is the out-door relief strictly limited, and the in-door relief offered as a rule, or what is the practice?

What we are trying to aim at, at least what I am trying to aim at, is the gradual extinction of out-door relief. We give relief to old people over 60 years of age under certain conditions; we give the labour yard to able-bodied persons under certain conditions; and in nearly all cases we take the children of widows to the schools; that is, some of the children.

3085. Are you in favour of the system of labour yards, or do you regard it only as a temporary expedient?

I regard it only as a temporary expedient, but at the present time I am in favour of a well-managed labour yard; I wish particularly to mention that, "a well-managed labour yard."

3086. Is that because you think it is impossible at present to enforce generally a system of giving orders for the house?

Exactly.

3087. Would you state your reasons for thinking that it is necessary to have a labour yard?

The principal reason is that there is at the present time no charitable system to take the place of out-door relief; if there were, we think there would be no necessity for giving the out-door relief or offering the labour yard to the respectable
respectable able-bodied poor. May I just read what I mean by a well-managed labour yard?

3088. If you please?
A well-managed labour yard is where the superintendent of the yard is thoroughly well qualified by being very firm in making the men do their work, and at the same time without any undue harshness; where a thorough investigation is made into the character of the men admitted by the relieving officers; where the yard is only open during times of depression and severe weather; where the enclosed scale of relief (which I have here) is given; where no single men are admitted; where they are only allowed to work for a month at a time. It must be remembered that no upper class workman, skilled mechanic, or respectable artizan, ever applies for parish relief; they would sooner starve first, and certainly would never go into the labour yard. There is, however, a class below these, composed of painters, general labourers, bricklayers' labourers, &c., whose work is at times very slack, and who are very hard pushed to maintain themselves and their families. A number of these are improvident, idle, and worthless, and should only have the workhouse offered them; but there are a number of the same class who are honest, respectable working men, and it is for them, I think, that a well-managed labour yard is useful. There is, however, in addition to these two classes, a large number of the lowest class, whose whole lives are spent in trying to live either on Poor Law relief or charitable relief; and this class should never be admitted into the labour yard; the workhouse is the only relief that should be given them. The scale to which I have alluded is as follows:—

SAINT PANCRAS.

SCALE of Relief allowed to Persons Employed at the Out-door Labour Yard at Bower Cottage, Leighton-road, N.W.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M E N.</th>
<th>No. of Children</th>
<th>Relief per Day.</th>
<th>Description of the Relief in Kind.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single men or widowers, without children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and wife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>One child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Two children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Three children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Four children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Five children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Six children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TASK of Work.

Maximum Quantity of Stone to be Broken per Day. Maximum Quantity of Oakum to be Picked per Day.

| 10 bushels. | 4 lbs. |

3089. I do not quite gather why you think it should be out of the question to offer the house to all these persons to whom you give relief in the labour yard; what is the reason why you think you either could not or should not do it? (70.)

X x

Because
Because I think so long as the Poor Law regulations are, that the guardians may give by a labour test, we as guardians are bound to make use of them.

3090. Surely it is not obligatory upon the guardians in London, is it?

No.

3091. Therefore, the guardians are to exercise their discretion. I am not questioning their discretion, but wishing to ascertain what your own opinion is as to the reason why it would be impossible in St. Pancras to pursue the course pursued in St. George's-in-the-East or Whitechapel, namely, to have no labour yard, and to offer the house to all these people?

Because I think there are a great many respectable, deserving working men to whom it is unfair to send them into the workhouse. I think that the labour yard for two or three weeks, or sometimes even less than that, is quite sufficient; at least we find it so in St. Pancras. I am quite aware that I stand rather alone in this respect among the guardians, and therefore I am anxious to explain my views on the point.

3092. Then I understand that your reason is that you think there are some poor, whom you term deserving, to whom it would be a hardship to have the house offered to them?

Yes.

3093. May I ask you what is your definition of a deserving poor man from the point of view of the Poor Law; would you consider a man deserving who had worked for high wages as a painter or bricklayer all the summer, saved nothing, and in winter comes to you for relief in your labour yard; is that a deserving person?

No, certainly not.

3094. Then who would be deserving?

A deserving man I should take to be a man thrown out of work from no fault of his own; for instance, his employer might have failed, as I know in some cases has happened in St. Pancras. It is very hard that that man should be sent into the workhouse, I think.

3095. Admitting that that would be a hard case, would not that be a small proportion of those men whom you have in your labour yard?

Yes, I take it, it would be.

3096. Is it not probable that in your labour yard you have a good many men who might perfectly well have laid by enough to support them during the temporary depression of the winter?

There is no doubt some might have; but I think the work of the last three or four years has been slack, slack even in the summer time, and I believe there are a great many of them that could not have laid by sufficient.

3097. Do not you think that the establishment of labour yards tends directly to discourage thrift on the part of men who have high wages during certain portions of the year?

I think it does; but I should think it is a temporary expedient that we in St. Pancras cannot do without.

3098. What would be the evil results if you stopped the labour yard?

That there would be a great deal of hardship among those people who have only casual employment during the winter, and they would have to go into the house.

3099. Do you think that a large part of them would accept relief in the house?

Some of them who could not help themselves.

3100. Would not a good many decline the offer of the house?

A good many would.

3101. Why should those who would decline the order be supported at the expense of the State?

I do
I do not know why they should be. Still it is the Local Government Board's Order and we have it in our power to give them relief in the labour yard.

3102. The object, I apprehend, of the Poor Law is to prevent any injury to health from destitution, from want of food, or from want of shelter or clothing; but if you offer the refuge of the house to these men they obtain relief from their destitution, and is it advisable to encourage a great number who you say would not accept relief in the house to accept relief out of the rates, who, in point of fact, do not absolutely require it?

I think there is no doubt that if the Poor Law were administered strictly all over London it would be very much better if all these people were offered the workhouse; I quite admit that, because I am dead opposed to out-door relief in any shape; but, as I said, I look upon this as a temporary expedient; we have considered it up to the present time advisable for St. Pancras, and I think, on the whole, that it has worked fairly well.

3103. How many men have you had at one time in the labour yard?
This last winter we have had an average of 45 or 50 a day.

3104. And would that represent about the whole number who would require to be relieved in the workhouse?
I should think it would.

3105. Therefore, if you were simply to accommodate 50 more persons in your workhouse, the whole of this labour yard might stop?
No, it would not be quite that, because they come in one day and perhaps a man may get work the next day.

3106. Different persons, you mean, might come next day?
Yes.

3107. Have you at any time observed abuses in your labour yard, for instance, men coming for relief who, you have found out afterwards, might perfectly well have supported themselves?
No, because the relieving officers are very careful in that respect, and make a strict investigation into the cases before they are admitted, and there lies the gist of the whole matter.

3108. Is it not probable that if you were to stop your labour yard and give orders for the house to every one who applied, it would stimulate private charity very much?
Probably it would.

3109. Have you any special charitable organisation at the present time in St. Pancras working with the guardians?
No, we have not anything of that kind.

3110. Of late years has your administration been stricter?
Yes.

3111. And have you found that that has tended to diminish the total amount of pauperism?
Yes; there is no doubt the out-door poor have diminished enormously; may I just read the statistics with regard to out-door relief?

3112. Please?
In 1873, 30,799 l. was given in out-door relief; in 1881, when I became chairman of the out-relief committee, 19,674 l. was given in out-relief; in 1887, last year, 8,636 l. was given in out-relief; so that during the time I have been chairman of the out-relief committee there has been a decrease of 11,000 l. a year in out-door relief; and I will venture to say that not the slightest injustice has been done to any individual person in decreasing that out-door relief.

3113. And it is your opinion that, with prudence in the administration, you may draw the reins tighter still?
Yes.

(70.)
3114. And with ultimate advantage, not only to the rates but to the poor generally?
   Certainly; by degrees we should gradually extinguish out-door relief altogether.

3115. How do you make inquiry with regard to these cases; is it made by the Board or by your relieving officers, or in what way?
   With regard to the out-door poor, do you mean?

3116. Yes?
   It is the duty of the relieving officers to make strict inquiries, and they report not to the Board but to the out-relief committee; we sit once every week, and these cases are brought before us, and if their investigation is not complete I always adjourn the case for another fortnight until it is; and then, if I am not satisfied, I visit myself.

3117. Have you any experience of other labour yards in London?
   No, I have not.

3118. You have heard, of course, that there are great abuses in some?
   Yes, there are great abuses in some.

3119. But your evidence goes to show that in St. Pancras strict supervision has prevented any such?
   Yes; I may say I was quite astonished when I heard Mr. Jones, the relieving officer say here, that men were at work in the labour yard in the daytime who had been at work all night on the river. That is not the fault of the labour yard, that is entirely Mr. Jones’s fault, the fault of the relieving officer for allowing it; at least I should say so.

3120. Do you yourself personally visit the poor in their own homes in order to ascertain whether they are deserving cases?
   Yes, nearly all doubtful cases I visit myself, all I can find time for.

3121. As chairman of the out-relief committee?
   Yes.

3122. That, however, is a special practice on your part, not a general practice?
   No, it is not a general practice.

3123. Do you think where that is not done, a really strict inquiry can be enforced through the ordinary relieving officers?
   Unless something of that sort is done, I think the relieving officers are naturally rather inclined to become slack; they would not take that care about making strict inquiries which I think is necessary, unless a person like myself goes and checks their statements.

3124. I suppose in the administration of the Poor Law in a London union (of which I have no personal experience) practically, as a rule; a very large number of the cases are unknown to the guardians?
   Entirely.

3125. They have no personal knowledge of them?
   They have no personal knowledge of them.

3126. In that respect they are at a great disadvantage as compared with a rural union, where almost invariably some guardian is personally acquainted with the applicant?
   Yes.

3127. So that in a London union you are dependent upon your relieving officer to a great extent?
   Dependent almost entirely upon him.

3128. That would be rather a strong argument, would it not, against out-door relief in populous places being given to any great extent?
   It would.

3129. You
3129. You, I think, are also chairman of the casual ward committee?
Yes.

3130. Have you anything to tell me on that subject?
I will just read to you what I have written on that point. Our casual ward is situated in Kentish Town, and has accommodation for 35 males and 35 females. The male side is nearly always full; the female side never. The open room system is adopted, that is, in opposition to the cell system. The casuals are admitted between 4 and 8 p.m. The superintendent takes down all particulars. If they are strangers they have to stay one clear day, and either break 7 cwt. of stone or pick 4 lbs. of oakum. If they have been in the casual wards of the metropolis during the month they are detained three clear days. The nearest casual wards to ours are Hampstead and Islington, each about half-an-hour's walk. If ours is full they are directed on there. The great majority of the persons admitted are old hands, have been known to the superintendent for years, and turn up regularly at different times in the year. The great majority are single men and single women. In 1876 the numbers admitted were 13,333; in 1882, after the passing of the Detention Act, the numbers fell to 3,723; in 1888 the numbers rose to 4,820. This increase is due, I believe, partly to the want of employment in the country, and partly to the idea that there is always charity of some sort to be procured in London. I always make a point of seeing any new cases that are in the casual ward at the time of my visiting, with a view of seeing whether any permanent benefit can be done for them; but during the five years that I have visited I have not come across more than half a dozen whom it was possible to assist.

3131. Are you in favour of the open room system as compared with the cell system?
No. I would much rather have the cell system.

3132. It has been suggested by some witnesses that casual wards might be altogether abolished, and all persons applying for relief taken into the workhouse on the same terms as other paupers; what do you think of that suggestion?
I think it a very good one indeed; but the difficulty that I see is, that our workhouses, as they are at the present time, would have to be very largely increased, at least I should think so, and we cannot do that in St. Pancras; we have no space, no extra room.

3133. But assume that room could be procured and the expense properly incurred, you would see no objection to that?
I should see very great advantage, because of the extra discipline that is maintained in the workhouse.

3134. You heard the evidence of Miss Twining about what are generally known as ins and outs?
Yes.

3135. Do you agree with her that we might have a more strict system with regard to them?
Yes, I think so. The ins and outs are the persons who give more trouble to the guardians than any other class of persons, and I was very much struck with what Mr. Hedley, I think it was, said here, that they should be detained, I think he said, for a week; that appears to me to be the proper course.

3136. You think a week would be sufficient?
Yes.

3137. Not going so far as Miss Twining suggested, that you might even detain them a month in a case where they had been very frequently in.
I think I should like to try the week first of all.

3138. Have you yourself personally observed many agricultural labourers coming into your parish during the last two or three years, and applying for relief?
I have not come across one; certainly not one who was a regular agricultural labourer has applied to us for relief during the last two or three years.

(70.)  x x 3  3139. Would
3139. Would you be rather disposed to think that, although a considerable additional number may have come in in the last three or four years, it has been rather exaggerated?

I think a great many have come in; but what I do know, what I am going to tell you afterwards with respect to the Mansion House Council, is that all these fresh agricultural labourers are immediately taken on by employers in London, and they ont the unfortunate Londoner.

3140. So that the effect is seen, not in the application for relief from agricultural labourer-, but in the application for relief of men who otherwise would have been employed to do the work?

Yes.

3141. Is that because the agricultural labourers are found more efficient?

Yes; they are stronger, stronger looking men, healthier looking men, and they do not know quite so much as the Londoner does.

3142. What they are taken on for is for rough ordinary work, I suppose?

Yes.

3143. But which can be done practically by almost any labourer?

Yes.

3144. And for that work the stronger a man is the better?

Yes.

3145. You said something about the Mansion House Committee; have you had any experience of the distribution of charities by that committee?

I am the chairman of the Mansion House Council, which has been sitting this winter, and I am the chairman of what is called the reference committee, which has been inquiring into the cases of all the men employed by the Public Gardens' Association, that is Lord Meath's scheme, and I have just got my report ready; I am going to submit it to the Lord Mayor next week, so that it is not public property yet, but I can give you the results, if you like to have them, of our investigation.

3146. If you please:

I may tell you that we had nothing to do with the taking over of the men; that was left to Lord Meath's Committee; but the manager forwarded to us the names of 456 men, 406 married and 50 single men. I may say that I saw the whole of these men myself, and questioned them; 62, or about 14 per cent., to whom tickets were given, did not present themselves at the works, but assigned no reason; 194, or about 30 per cent., were dismissed at various times for misconduct, continued absence, or incapacity; 164, or about 36 per cent., after careful, and in some cases prolonged, investigation, the committee found themselves powerless to raise from their present position. Our object, or rather the Lord Mayor's object, was to see whether any permanent benefit could be done to these men, and prevent them from being in the ranks of the unemployed again next winter; and 164, or about 36 per cent., we found we could not do anything at all for. Then 17, or about 4 per cent., left the works of their own accord for better employment; 53, or about 12 per cent., were assisted by being made members of trade or benefit societies, by migration, by obtaining or taking out of pawn tools and clothes when there was a definite prospect of work, and in other ways; and 26, or 6 per cent., were emigrated to the Colonies at their own request; so that out of the whole total we were only able to do anything for 79.

3147. What class of men did they principally belong to?

The occupations of the men actually employed were stated to be as follows:

238 were general labourers, painters' labourers, bricklayers' labourers; 28 were painters; 11 bricklayers; 27 gardeners; 15 carmen; 16 porters; and the rest were various; but the majority were all men who were liable, from the nature of their employment, to be out of work during the winter months.

3148. Do you think the general effect of that employment which has been given has been good, or the contrary?

I say
I say it is very bad indeed, I think, as the results of our inquiries, and that is what we are going to report to the Lord Mayor.

3140. And for what reason do you think it bad?

For this reason: that these men are always out of employment in the winter, and next winter they will look forward again exactly to the same. If Lord Meath does not find them employment next winter, I think they will think themselves very much aggrieved. And then, not only that; there are, at least, I think, have ascertained or heard that there are, generally somewhere about 20,000 men in London out of employment at some time or other during the winter; therefore, the giving of employment by Lord Meath to 300 or 400 is perfectly absurd; it does not touch the question at all. I think we have done some little amount of good by emigrating the 26 men, but beyond that, I do not think we have done any good at all.

3150. And I apprehend from your answer that you would not be in favour of the institution of relief works generally for the purpose of finding employment for people who could not get employment otherwise in London?

No; the tendency of such relief works is to bring labour from the country into London and further glut the market; there is no doubt about it.

3151. In fact it might be compared, might it not, to a cask without a bottom, the more you poured in the more you might pour in?

Yes.

3152. Is there any other point you would like to draw our attention to?

Yes; I cannot allow the remark made by Mr. Francis Peek, published in the "Times" this morning, that the Poor Law had utterly failed, to pass without a protest. So far as St. Pancras is concerned, I may say that the administration of relief in that union is universally praised, even by the socialists. The Poor Law of England is, and must be, necessarily severe. It has nothing to do with deserving or undeserving; its sole function is to relieve destitution and destitution only, directly it goes beyond that, it acts unjustly to the poorer rate-payers, and the struggling independent working men. The failure is, not with the Poor Law, but with the great body of the charitable public who permit deserving cases, which Mr. Peek admits are so very few, to come to the Poor Law at all. If instead of squandering their money on totally unworthy objects, they would concentrate their energies on assisting the deserving only, there would be ample money, enough and to spare, for adequately and completely assisting every deserving case in the Metropolis. I consider that co-operation between the Poor Law and charity is an absolute necessity. The present chaotic and idiotic system of every person and every association giving away relief, entirely independently of every one else, and without any communication whatever with the Poor Law Authorities, is the means of making London the paradise of leper and idler, whilst at the same time it disguises and embezzles the feelings of the respectable working men, and produces more mischief and more class hatred than anything else. There must be then an organised system. London is far too large to be dealt with as a whole, and therefore the local authorities in each Poor Law Union, acting in concert with the charitable and well-to-do residents of that union, are the only persons who can deal efficiently with local distress. There is another point I should like to press upon your Lordships' attention, and that is with regard to the relief given by the clergy. As Secretary of the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association, I am in communication with the clergy in all parts of London (that is the poor parts), and I know it is impossible for them, where they have a parish of 7,000 or 8,000, all poor, to relieve all the wants and necessities of that number, and only 30 l. or 40 l. a year to do it with. Over and over again they have told me they are nothing more than relieving officers, and have very little time left for their spiritual work. I would suggest then that the relief given by the clergy should be confined to the sick and aged, and no others. The relief of the sick is the natural duty of the clergy. There is no mistake about a person who is ill, and the clergy therefore cannot be imposed upon by them in the same way as they can by the able-bodied. If this system were established all over London, and were per-
factly understood and acted upon by the clergy and the poor, I feel certain the
ground would be considerably cleared, and enormous advantages both to the
deserving poor and to the charitable public would result.

3153. Have you at all considered how you would bring the boards of
guardians and the charitable associations together?
It is very very difficult; I am afraid I cannot answer that question. We have
tried; we try to work with the Charity Organisation Society. Unfortunately
the Charity Organisation Society is not liked by some members of our board of
guardians, and they object to work with them. I may state that I am a very
old Charity Organisation Societyist myself, and have worked on it almost ever
since it was formed, and I hold strong opinions about it; but there are a
number of my fellow guardians who do not like it; and so we cannot get that
cooperation which I should like to see.

3154. It must be, of course, entirely by voluntary arrangement; no inter-
position by law is possible?
No.

3155. But I suppose what you would say is that guardians when they had
investigated cases, and found that they were of such a nature that they could
properly be relieved by a charitable association, should refer those cases to the
association, whatever it might be, to be dealt with according to their practice
and rules?
Yes.

3156. In that way the charitable organisation would get the benefit of the
investigation by the board of guardians?
Yes.

3157. And, on the other hand, if the charitable organisation found cases
which they thought not suitable for their own work, they might be referred to
the relieving officer, and might be brought before the board of guardians?
Yes. I think in every parish and union in London there ought to be concert
between the board of guardians and what I should call a charitable council, or
whatever you like to call it; that in that way you can meet the distress of that
particular locality, because it differs all over London; we in St. Pancras do not
suffer in the same way as they do down at Poplar or Bermondsey.

3158. Earl of Strafford.] Have you taken any interest in the question of the
boarding out of pauper children?
It is not my department; but I have taken a great interest in it.

3159. Do you approve of the system of boarding out?
Most decidedly.

3160. Do you think it might be with advantage extended?
I do not see how you can extend it very well.

3161. There are restrictions at present?
Guardians can only board out deserted and orphan children; you could not
extend it, so far as I see at present, beyond them; there is only a certain per-
centage in our schools that could be boarded out; we have between 500 and
600 in our schools at Leazesden, and out of those 500 or 600 children I do not
suppose we could board out more than 50 or 60.

3162. But as far as it has gone you think the system has worked well?
It has worked admirably.

3163. And that the amount paid for them is sufficient for their maintenance?
Yes, quite sufficient.

3164. Do you know anything of a charitable institution at Kilburn, the
Sisters of Mercy?
I have heard of it.

3165. Are you aware that during the winter they are in the habit of giving
free
free meals and providing work for the able-bodied poor, and work-rooms for the women and children?

I knew they gave free meals; I did not know that they provided work.

3166. Work to a certain extent for the able-bodied men, and work-rooms for the women and their children. But you have never been there?

No.

3167. Chairman.] I omitted to ask you on one or two points which I should like you to make clear. Perhaps you would like to state exactly how you deal with the sick and infirm paupers who apply for out-relief in St. Pancras?

In the sick cases we invariably give an order for the infirmary, if they can be removed there, and if the illness is of such a kind as to require the sick person to be moved there. I consider that the parish infirmaries (I listened to what Miss Twining said just now) have been a greater blessing to London than anything that ever happened.

3168. In the case of the aged and infirm, how do you deal with them when the application is from poor persons who are disabled by age from maintaining themselves?

Out-door relief is given to persons over 60 years of age who are of good character, whose relatives are doing all in their power to assist, and who are still able by their own exertions to earn a trifle, sufficient with the out-door relief to enable them to live decently and respectively. Out-door relief is taken away from old people when they are past work, when they have outlived their friends, have nobody to look after them, and only the out-door relief to depend upon. We do that, not because we like giving out-door relief, but simply because there is no system at present to take its place, and we contend that no old person can live simply on the out-door relief, 2 s. 6 d. a week, alone.

3169. Even in those cases you contemplate eventually discontinuing out-door relief?

Yes, certainly.

3170. But you would look to deserving cases getting charitable assistance?

Yes, and as soon as that takes place we should be only too delighted to do away with out-door relief.

3171. I think you said with reference to widows' children that you sent a proportion of them to schools?

Yes.

3172. Will you just state also the practice with regard to widows with children?

As a general rule a widow with children dependent upon her is offered the choice of taking as many of the children as the guardians think necessary to the parish schools. We consider that two children are as many as any woman can maintain by her own exertions. If a widow, say with six children dependent on her, applies to the guardians, we offer to take four to the schools. We know perfectly well if she has out-door relief she cannot maintain them properly; she has to live very often in an underground kitchen in a back street, for economy's sake; she has to work hard all day, very often away from home, has no time to attend to the children, and very often ruins her health. The children have no one to look after them, and play about in the street; as soon as they are of an age to earn anything the girls are sent out to what is called a "little place," earning 2 s. or 3 s. a week and their food, coming home to sleep. The boys are sent out as errand boys as early as possible, and, having learnt no trade, increase that large number of unskilled labourers which is the curse of London at the present time. On the contrary, if the four children are sent to the schools at the most critical time of their life, they are well fed, well clothed, well educated, and taught a trade. The boys at the proper age are sent out in a fair way of earning their own living, and if their friends are unable to obtain situations for them, are apprenticed by the guardians. The girls have good situations found for them, and when placed out are carefully looked after by the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants for the first two or three
three years. I give you now the results of the last year’s report by the officer who has charge of these cases. The total number of cases that were out under our supervision at that time was 123 boys and 56 girls. The report is that 111 boys and 43 girls are “very satisfactory;” four boys and six girls are “not satisfactory;” eight boys and seven girls are “very bad.”

3173. Have you found any serious objection on the part of widows to letting their children go?

The most sensible of them prefer to let them go at once. There is a large number of widows we have who come and try it on to get the out-door relief; but if the guardians are firm (in the same way as we are in most cases) then they eventually give in, and come afterwards and thank us very much indeed for taking the children.

3174. Have you heard any complaints on the part of the poor generally that the system is too hard, or have you not found that so?

No, I have not found it so at all.

3175. I think you wish to express some opinion as to the election of guardians?

Yes. As to that I should like to state that the present system of yearly election I think works very badly indeed, because as soon as a guardian has really learnt his or her work, that guardian is liable to be turned out, and you have to begin all over again. I think the triennial system would be the best.

3176. Would you wish that the whole board should be elected triennially?

Yes, the same as the School Board.

3177. Not that a third should go out annually?

No; but in the same way as the School Board.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. GEORGE RICHARDSON STRACHAN, having been called in; is
Examined, as follows:

3178. Earl of Aberdeen.] You are Surveyor to the Vestry of Chelsea, are you not?

I am.

3179. How long have you occupied that post?

Three and a-half years.

3180. Was it under your supervision that works for the relief of the unemployed were carried out in Chelsea during the years 1886, 1887, and 1888?

Yes.

3181. Of what did those works consist?

Of wood paving works, that is, taking up the macadam road and placing wood pavement in its place; converting a disused burial-ground into public gardens; and during snow storms removing snow; we have done a good deal in that way.

3182. Will you describe the circumstances under which instructions were given for carrying out these works?

On the 1st of December 1885, the vestry passed a resolution that King’s-road, from Limerston-street to Stanley Bridge, and also Pont-street, should be paved with wood, and further, that provision should be made in the estimates for the next financial year for doing such works, the financial year commencing on March 26th; but on the 11th of February 1886, the Local Government Board sent round a circular asking that as much work as possible should be put in hand at once, and at the vestry meeting on the 16th of February that letter was
was considered. On the 16th the vestry resolved to convert the disused burial-ground of St. Luke's into public gardens, and at the vestry meeting on the 23rd of February they in-structed me to proceed with the wood paving works in King's-road, thus anticipating their former resolution in consequence of the letter from the Local Government Board; and they further instructed me to employ Chelsea men who were out of work.

3183. Had you had brought under your own notice any special emergency as regards the number of unemployed persons in the district?

Various estimates were formed, but none that were reliable, and I do not know that I had, or that anyone had, any reliable estimate of the number out of work in Chelsea.

3184. Was it the general impression in the district that there was a great deal of suffering?

Undoubtedly there was. A branch of the Mansion House Committee sat at the Town Hall to relieve the distress, and I applied to them, thinking that the works about to be carried out would assist them in their labours.

3185. Will you describe the steps taken in connection with that undertaking, more especially regarding the way of relieving exceptional distress?

I applied to the Mansion House Sub-Committee to give me 100 men who were out of work who, they were to vouch, were genuine Chelsea men, and who desired employment; and on the 13th of March these men came to me at the vestry's wharf and were selected. The men were selected upon no other principle than that they were out of work; the only questions asked being, Are you the person recommended, How long have you been out of work, and, How many have you dependent upon you.

3186. Whom did you reject?

Simply those who had none dependent upon them. If a stalwart young man came who had no family, no father and no mother to support, and no sisters to keep, he was told to stand on one side till the others were given work.

3187. Eventually all these selected were of that class you mentioned as having some one dependent upon them?

Yes.

3188. What became of the others?

I only started with 100 men on the King's-road works, but gradually we increased the number till we had on the King's-road very nearly 300 men.

3189. Were any obstacles met with in carrying out this system?

The men of course were not used to the work, and when we started I had half-a-dozen men who were used to it, to show them how to go about it; and after a while the men became more used to it and gave more satisfaction in their work. The whole of the works, I may say, were carried on on commercial principles. We endeavoured to keep away from the men as much as possible the idea that they were relief works. For instance, if a man was habitually late in the morning, he was paid off; if he was lazy, and did not do his fair amount of work, he was warned; if there was bad conduct of any kind he was discharged, just as in ordinary works. The only difficulty that occurred was on the 7th of April. I should have mentioned that as the men were put to better work, their pay was increased from 4d. per hour to 5d. per hour. A gang of men who had been making concrete were asked to go back to hacking up the road for a few days as there was no concrete to be made. While making concrete they had 5d. per hour, but the wage for hacking up the road was 4d. per hour; and they refused to go back to the 4d., and they went on strike, as they called it. I discharged them on the spot, paid their money, and started 23 other men who were waiting for work. That was the only difficulty we had throughout the work.

(70.)

3190. Were
3190. Were there a large number of men waiting to be taken on throughout the progress of the work?
   I should say from 20 to 30 were constantly standing about the works, probably more.

3191. Had you any cases of men applying to be taken on, and then leaving the works of their own accord?
   Yes; I had many cases where a man would come to me and say he had a chance of getting work elsewhere if he could be allowed a few hours' leave to go and inquire; and in every case it was allowed, though he was not paid for that time; and as the spring came on we changed the men considerably in that way.

3192. We have heard from other witnesses that under similar circumstances men have applied for work and in a very short time absented themselves, from no apparent cause except unwillingness to labour; was that your experience?
   Not in Chelsea.

3193. Could you describe generally the occupations of the men taken on?
   We took notes in the King's-road. I cannot give you the number for each employment; but when we started we had men who worked for 4d., an hour who were carpenters, plasterers, bricklayers, fitters, shoemakers, watchmakers, printers, batters, gentlemen's servants, and others.

3194. Will you describe the rate of progress in the work; was it satisfactory, and so on?
   Most satisfactory; we finished much under the time we had allowed ourselves, having done the whole of the work in six and a-half weeks, which was at the rate of 1,000 square yards of finished work per week.

3195. In consequence of that success, was the system carried on further?
   The vestry, in consequence of the "success" you have mentioned, ordered me to pave Oakley-street with wood, which had not previously been contemplated; and that went on under the same conditions. I may mention that it is now our show road; it is the very best one we have.

3196. Were any others taken in hand?
   Yes; we finished Oakley-street on the 10th of June; then the summer came, and the work was suspended. On the 20th of September we commenced Pont-street under the same conditions, and finished on the 8th of November.

3197. Had it been the intention of the vestry to carry out this work quite irrespective of the want of employment in the district?
   In the case of King's-road and Pont-street, yes. Oakley-street is distinctly a case where the vestry ordered it to be done because of the success of the experiment, or of the need of the work.

3198. From the point of view of giving employment, you mean?
   Yes.

3199. Was it done in co-operation with the guardians of the poor?
   No, we are separate bodies, and have no connection whatever with one another.

3200. I dare say you have got other statistics as to the details of the work; but, without asking you for details, will you tell me was your experiment on the whole successful, and as to the cost?
   I have prepared here some statistics of the cost for King's-road, if I might put them in.
The Vestry of the Parish of Chelsea.
Wood Paving Works, 1886.
King's-road [Limerston-street to Lots-road].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballast, sand, &amp;c.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studs for blocks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital for use of plant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs to tools, &amp;c.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing cement, water, &amp;c.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising granite crossings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New gullies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost per square yard, 9 s. 10 d.
Unemployed received in wages 30 per cent. of total cost.
The sum charged as "Capital for use of plant" equals 25 per cent. of total capital used for plant.
As a set off to this cost 1,440 cubic yards of screened granite, and 196 tons of granite channel stones, were obtained from the work and stored in the depot for future use, for which no credit is given in the above figures.

3201. With regard to the Return you have just handed in, have you any comparative statement showing the relative cost of similar work under ordinary conditions?
Yes; our previous work of wood paving had cost the vestry some 10 s. 6 d. per square yard.

3202. Was that by contract?
Yes; the cost of the King's-road wood paving, which was the most expensive one we had, was 9 s. 10 d. per square yard, but it is only fair to say that materials were certainly cheaper when we did the King's-road than when the contract works were executed. The vestry and myself are clearly of opinion that the price of 9 s. 10 d. per square yard is a very fair value.

3203. And throughout the operation of that system did you limit the employment of the men to those who belonged to Chelsea?
Distinctly; with each case I had a certificate from a person whom I could reach, that this man who was recommended was a Chelsea man.

3204. From your experience do you think that if there had not been that stipulation you would have had people from other quarters applying for this work?
I have no doubt of that; because in the case of snowstorms, where I have not such a limit, I can have as many men as I please, ordinarily 600 or 700.

3205. Have you anything further to add on the same point?
The only point about the figures I should like to mention is, that the money that went to the unemployed was, as near as can be, 30 per cent. of the total cost; 30 per cent. of the total cost was spent directly in wages to the unemployed; the rest went in materials, cartage, and so on.

3206. The wages were at what you call the market rate?
Four-pence per hour would be a little under the market rate for a labourer; but as we got on with the work, the carpenters were put on to do the paving, and were paid the full rate of 9 d. per hour.
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3207. Was
3207. Was there any discontent expressed on the part of the trade societies with this way of doing the work?
None whatever.

3208. In carrying out these relief works, were there any obstacles interposed by a public body, or otherwise?
Yes. It is necessary for the Vestry to obtain the consent of the Metropolitan Board of Works to close any public road. In the first instance the consent was refused. A modified application was made to overcome the difficulty, and the engineer of the Board reported against it, and the Board approved of his report; but in consequence of the very serious protest made by the vestry's member of the Metropolitan Board of Works, they undid their own decision and allowed us to go on.

3209. Chairman.] What was the ground on which they had refused?
They said we should do it in half-widths at a time, instead of closing the road, and that was practically prohibitory.

3210. It was a mere question then, as I understand, as to the mode of proceeding, and not as regards the people to be employed?
Quite so.

3211. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have the vestry authorities decided to continue this system now, without reference to a special want of employment?
Yes, I have just finished paving Stanley Bridge with wood, a small job, and I am now going to pave part of King's-road, and the men out of work in Chelsea will be employed.

3212. Do you get men who have been employed in the labour yard of the workhouse?
Yes; in the case of Stanley Bridge I cleared the stone-yard, took all the men from there.

3213. I suppose that falls in with the views of the workhouse authorities?
They appreciated it.

3214. Do they get more money for your work than they get at the labour yard?
Yes; a man on the wood-paving work, working ordinary hours, gets 19s. 6d. a week.

3215. You mentioned that you had got instructions to renovate a disused burial-ground as a place of recreation; I presume the steps taken in that case were somewhat similar to those you have already described?
They varied in this respect, that it took us 11 months to get the faculty to make the necessary arrangements; and then I inserted a further condition before employing the men, that they should have been at least three months' residents of Chelsea.

3216. But ultimately the system was successful, was it?
I cannot put the St. Luke's Gardens so high as I put the wood-paving work; there is not the same opportunity for supervision, and the work does not go along with such a swing as it does with wood-paving. I think I may also say for St. Luke's Gardens that the vestry did not lose much, perhaps 100l., at the outside; but I could not put that work so high as the wood-paving work.

3217. Do you find that these men work more vigorously or less vigorously than the men employed under the usual system?
Less vigorously.

3218. And they are paid less?
Yes, certainly. If I were to do this work in the market I would employ stalwart men, who would get 6d. or 7d. per hour, talking of the whole of the work generally.

3219. Notwithstanding that you think that the time occupied was not greater?
We had more men.

3220. For
3220. For the same money?
For the same money.

3221. Chairman.] You said that this was conducted on commercial principles, but how can it be a commercial principle to employ men who are inferior in their power of working, at low wages; is that a commercial principle?
No, what I meant was that my part of it was conducted upon commercial principles; my Vestry instructed me to employ these men, and having to employ them, I conducted it on what I thought commercial principles.

3222. That is to say, you did not give them more than you thought they were worth?
That is so.

3223. As many of these men were, as you say, perfectly unaccustomed to that work, how is it possible they could perform the work at the same cost as experienced men?
I do not know how, but it was done.

3224. Is it explicable on any ground that work done by men who do not understand the work, is as cheap as work done by men who understand it?
Not in skilled work; but in reference to work of this character, which is backing the road, merely a matter of strength, the greater portion of the work was of that nature.

3225. But now, supposing that you had, as surveyor, merely had to see this work done efficiently, would you have employed these men?
Not under ordinary circumstances, certainly not.

3226. Then does not that imply that there must have been a loss on this job?
No, I would not employ them, because these men are much more trouble to look after than ordinary men.

3227. But the work is of such a nature, is it, that an unskilled man can do it as cheaply as a skilled man?
At this rate of wages, and under those conditions.

3228. The rate of wages was lower?
A strong and stalwart man would get from 6 d. to 7 d. per hour, these men got 4 d. to start with.

3229. You were, of course, acting under instructions, but did it occur to you that this might have been considered a hardship upon the ordinary labourers who would, under other circumstances, have done this work.
That question was discussed at the Vestry, and the Vestry ignored it.

3230. Probably it is not a point on which you would have anything to say? I am unable to suggest an answer to your difficulty.

3231. Would you have been able, at the time, to have procured labourers at a reasonable rate of wages to have performed the work?
I have no doubt of it whatever.

3232. You gave us a description of the class of men who were employed: carpenters, plasterers, watchmakers, and so forth; in your opinion were these men, men who, during the summer months had earned good wages?
I could not say that, because I have seen many of them walking about the streets since. I am afraid that they are not men who would be considered first-class workmen.

3233. They would probably belong to the class of men who never have regular employment?
Or who, if they ever had it, do not now have it.

3234. Was any inquiry made as to the character of the men?
None whatever. The police told me that in St. Luke's Gardens I had a great number of thieves.

(70.)
3235. Except in the case of Oakley-street, I understand that the work performed was work which the vestry would have had done in any case?
That is so; with that exception and St. Luke's Gardens.

3236. I spoke of the streets first; the gardens were undertaken purely upon charitable principles, I understand?
For many years there had been a desire upon the part of one body in the vestry to have them taken over, and they very adroitly seized this opportunity of getting it taken through.

3237. There existed a wish for these works independently of charitable grounds?
Yes; they were in a minority, and this opportunity placed them in a majority.

3238. Do you think that the institution of these relief works has given rise to the expectation on the part of this class of men that they will be similarly employed every winter?
In the first year, undoubtedly, in 1886. In 1887 the temper of the men rose very considerably, and they demanded work and put considerable pressure.

3239. And was work given them?
We went on with St. Luke's Gardens with the original intention, but that has died out.

3240. Do you mean that the expectation is no longer prevalent?
Yes.

3241. To what do you attribute its dying out?
I am unable to say; I do not know.

3242. Do you know at all what became of the men who you have told us were discharged because they would not continue to work at the wages then given?
They stood round the works for a good length of time, and then gradually drifted off into their own haunts, walking about the streets, and so forth. I do not know that they found employment elsewhere.

3243. I presume, therefore, that they were not without the means of living?
I cannot say; I do not know how these men do live at any time.

3244. Can you say from your own observation whether you think that the men who came to you for work really were workmen in distressed circumstances; meaning by distressed circumstances, men who had not means of subsistence?
I have no personal knowledge. I know the tales the men told me, and we tested some of them, and they were found to be true; men who had absolutely sold their furniture and clothes.

3245. Would your impression be that there was much imposture amongst these men, or not?
I should put it as high as 50 per cent.

3246. Of imposture?
Yes, and exaggeration; but undoubtedly behind all the tales of the men there was a dismal background of fact, which was very painful to listen to.

3247. Is there any labour yard in Chelsea?
Yes.

3248. Lord Spencer.] You have not quite answered the Chairman's question. You say the work went on to the 10th of June; of course, that covered the period when any exceptional circumstances from bad weather had ended?
Clearly.

3249. And you continued up to that time all these men not ordinarily accustomed to work with the pickaxe, and so on?
Yes; that is to say, the men who had been on King's-road were put on Oakley-street.

3250. Painters
3250. Painters and carpenters, and gentlemen's servants, you have told us? Yes, whatever they were.

3251. Who might at that time of year have got employment otherwise, perhaps? Yes.

3252. When you talked of the success, did you mean success in the way that the wood pavement was laid, and in regard to the cost? Yes; that the work was excellent, that the cost was a proper, fair, reasonable cost, and that the work was executed expeditiously.

3253. And these men like gentlemen's servants and others, who had not been accustomed for a long while to handle a pickaxe and shovel, soon fell to and did good work? Yes, we assisted the work of the men as much as possible. I used to pay the men 2s. at night, in order to enable them to get food, and if I noticed that their hands were sore, I put them on lighter work, moving the blocks about, but substantially your Lordship's statement is true.

3254. Were you persecuted during this time by many ordinary labourers whom you would otherwise have employed, wanting to get employment? None; I had no opposition of that sort; none of the men ordinarily in work complained in any way.

3255. Do you know at all what they were doing during this period? I do not.

3256. Were many of these men labourers from the country? I could not say. At the time we commenced, the men had to be Chelsea men; I have the exact figures for our works in St. Luke's Gardens. There were five gangers, that is, overlookers, 11 masons, eight bricklayers, 17 carpenters, 39 painters, 168 labourers, two watchmen, and three gatekeepers; a total of 253, of which the labourers are about 66 per cent. of the total.

3257. And these labourers, might they not be labourers who had come up a month or two before and settled in Chelsea, and therefore you might think they were Chelsea men, though they were really not long from the country? Scarcely; for this reason, that there was no idea of starting this work until the riot in Trafalgar-square happened.

3258. Do you know what the test was of a man being a Chelsea man? That he had to be at the moment when he applied for work, a resident in Chelsea; it did not extend a day beyond.

3259. Did you take any steps to prove whether they were really Chelsea men? In a few cases, but the proof on which I relied was this, that I depended upon the gentlemen who were on the sub-committee of the Mansion House for the statements being reliable. In the case of St. Luke's Gardens, in order to guard against the difficulty of men from Pimlico and districts outside my own drifting into it, we insisted upon having three months' residence, and the applicant had to have a letter from some ratepayer stating that. We had a lot of difficulty about that question, and the way we overcame it was this: every man outside we told, that if he could point out any one who had not been a three months' resident in Chelsea, we would have him discharged; and in that way we had them got rid of; there were only a few.


3261. You mentioned employing labour when a snow-storm came on? Yes.

3262. What sort of people do you get on occasions of snow-storms? We get first of all, all that I would put in the unemployed, and then after-(70.)
wards the more industrious labourers who are thrown out by the snow storm, and seize the opportunity of making a day's work.

3263. A different class of men to those you employ on the roads and gardens?
First of all the old class, and then a superior class; so that on the average they would be superior.

3264. Men who are out of work temporarily on account of it?
Yes, in addition to those out of work generally.

3265. Taking the snow storms of this last year, did they afford employment for a large number?
We have had as many as 650 of the men employed.

3266. For three or four days at a time?
Yes, the highest sum of money that we have spent is 376 l. for the snow-storm of the 4th of January 1887.

3267. What rate of wages?
Fourpence per hour.

3268. The same as the other work?
Yes, the same as the wood-paving.

3269. Lord Thring.] In that list you gave us of trades, do I understand that a watchmaker, for instance, or a gentleman's servant, could at once make 4 1/2 an hour enough to live on?
No, he did not earn it to us, but that was the minimum rate of wages; we paid everybody 4 1/2 d.

3270. But I want to know whether these men could really support themselves when you first put them on; could a gentleman's servant, at 4 1/2 d. per hour, do a day's work?
Digging up the roads was a heavy occupation, and moving the blocks was a much easier one, and if I found a man punished by the work I eased his work for him.

3271. You gave the men who could not work hard such easy work as they could do?
Yes.

3272. But if you had only wanted men to dig up roads, watchmakers or gentleman's servants could not have done that?
No; they would either have had to be punished by the work very severely, or to have gone.

3273. Earl of Strafford.] Have you some works now going on for the unemployed in Chelsea?
Next week we shall have.

3274. Shall you take the same class of men?
Yes.

3275. With the qualification that they are residents in Chelsea?
Yes.

3276. And you will conduct the work on the same conditions as you have described?
Yes.

3277. What sort of number?
This is a small job; it is relaying the wood; I daresay it will employ 100.

3278. And what sort of time will it last?
Perhaps a month.

3279. After that will you have another job for the unemployed?
No, I cannot see any ahead.

3280. Possibly
3280. Possibly when the winter comes? There are no more streets in Chelsea at the present moment that it would pay us to convert into wood paved roads.

3281. And no other work of another sort? No other burial grounds; and we are entirely built upon. I should like to mention that the position of these streets was such that the works did not add to the rates. The capital sunk in doing the work was exactly counterbalanced by the annual saving of the cost of the wood paved road as against the maintenance of the macadam road.

3282. The whole operation was paying? King's-road paid us well; Pont-street was balanced; Oakley-street we had a loss upon, in the sense that it would not at any time pay the vestry to convert it into a wood paved road; but the three roads taken together, on which we spent nearly 10,000l, left us in a state of financial equilibrium.

3183. Chairman. Speaking as a surveyor only, in undertaking these new works you are about to begin at Chelsea, would you adopt this system? Professionally, I would not; as a man, I would.

3284. I ask you the question professionally? I would not.

3285. On what ground? That it is not the proper way to go about work.

3286. If the work has been performed, as I understand you, at the same cost as it would have been performed if done otherwise, what really would be the foundation of your objection? This; that if I put it out to contract, I have to get to work at nine o'clock, and I have a clerk of the works, and my duty is simply to condemn bad work; I have no trouble whatever in doing it.

3287. That is personal to yourself? Yes.

3288. But in point of fact, I judge that as surveyor, you feel no objection to the work being done in this manner, looking at it in the point of view of the expense to the parish? None whatever on the point of expense, on the point of excellence, and on the point of speed. Oakley-street is our show road; I take my brother surveyors to go and look at it.

3289. Lord Thring. Then you do not think that this unskilled labour displaced better labour outside? I am bound to say that I think it did.

3290. Earl of Aberdeen. As a matter of fact, had you a great deal of trouble with the men? Not with the men who worked for us; we had a great deal of trouble with men who did not get work.

3291. Men demanding work? Yes; they followed me about to a considerable extent.

3292. Chairman. As to these men that the police told you were thieves, did you find them troublesome? Not exceptionally troublesome; they were rougher than our usual class of men.

3293. Lord Sandhurst. Taking a certain number of these worst class of men, did they just work for a couple of days and then go away? No; a feature of the work is the persistency with which they adhered to it.

3294. Earl of Aberdeen. That would rather imply, would it not, that those men were not thieves by choice? (70.)

That
That is a matter of inference. I can mention this, that we did not lose much plant off the ground.

3295. But you had to be constantly on the watch, early and late, to see that the work was done?
Yes.

3296. Do you think a contractor, when he has a gang of men, exercises less supervision over the men than you do?
Yes, I do; I find that it takes us just as much supervision in skilled men to look after a contractor to see that he does his work well, as it did with these men.

3297. Earl Spencer.] Does the contractor employ the same class of man?
No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.
Lords present:

Earl Spencer.
Earl of Onslow.
Earl of Strafford.
Earl of Kimberley.

Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Lord Sandhurst.
Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley, K.G., in the Chair.

Mr. Joseph Stephenson Horn, is called in; and examined, as follows:

3298. Chairman.] You are, I think, Clerk to the Board of Guardians of Burnley, in Lancashire?
That is so.

3299. Have you long held that office?
For the past six years, previous to which I was an overseer of the poor.

3300. Could you tell us what the proportion of in-door and out-door paupers has been for the past year at Burnley, and the population of your union?
Yes, I shall come to that.

3301. Are you desirous to make a general statement before I further examine you?
I thought that might be the best plan. The Burnley Union is entirely contained in the county of Lancaster, and consists of 26 townships. The population in 1881 was 118,334, being an increase of about 34 per cent. upon the previous census; and at the present time I estimate the population at 150,000. The people are chiefly engaged in cotton-weaving, coal-mining, loom-making, and agriculture. Relief is administered by six relief committees, whose proceedings are afterwards sanctioned by the board. In the union the recipients of relief numbered, on the 1st of January of this year, 1,725, divided as follows: 368 in-door; 1,357 out-door; being 21 per cent. indoor, 79 per cent. out-door. That, as compared with the entire county of Lancaster, and with England and Wales, gives rather a large proportion of the out-door poor. In the county, out of every 100 relieved, 66 received out-door relief, and 34 in-door relief. If we compare that with the entire country, England and Wales, we find that the outdoor is 74 per cent., and in-door 26 per cent. So that, both as regards the county of Lancaster as a whole, and England and Wales, we have a larger number receiving out-door relief. As regards the proportion of paupers to population, I find that in the Burnley Union in 1878 one person out of every 55 was a pauper; but in 1888, out-relief going on still in the same proportion, we improve, and have one pauper out of every 69. Now, how does that compare with the county of Lancaster, and with England and Wales? In the county of Lancaster in 1878 one person out of every 50 was a pauper; but in 1888 one out of every 47, not showing any improvement, but rather the reverse, under the in-door system. For the entire country, England and Wales, in 1878 one person in every 32 was a pauper; in 1888 it was virtually the same, one in 33, a slight improvement.

(70.)
3302. You spoke of the "in-door system" in Lancashire; but can that be properly said to have existed, when it appears that the out-door is very large, though not quite so large as the indoor relief?

Perhaps I ought not to have said in-door system, but my comparison was as to the larger indoor relief in Lancashire as compared with the Burnley Union. Now, comparing the cost per head of population for relief, that is to say, in-door and out-door combined, in 1887 the Burnley Union averaged 1 s. 11½ d. per head of the population; Lancashire, 2 s. 2 d.; the entire country, England and Wales, 3 s. 4 d. And I should like your Lordships to bear in mind, with respect to the cost per head of population, that the population of the Burnley Union has increased more rapidly than that of the county of Lancaster, or of England and Wales; but these calculations are based on the 1881 population. The guardians of the Burnley Union do not say that the high percentage of in-door poor in London and many large towns in some parts of the country is wrong; we say that the guardians of London, and the parts of the country where the workhouse is used to a very large extent, ought to know best as regards their particular locality; but with respect to the Burnley Union, where juvenile labour is in very great demand, we find it to the advantage of the union to judiciously give out-relief to a larger extent than many other parts of the country. Our out-relief is chiefly disbursed to old people of good character, to widows with children, and to persons who are destitute and are temporarily sick; but in no case do we hesitate to send into the workhouse the idle and the insolvent; but whilst doing that we have taken precautions that the children shall be kept as far away as possible from persons in the workhouse who have been sent in through being idle and insolvent; and for that purpose the guardians have gone to considerable expense in erecting six cottage homes, each home to accommodate 25 children. Over each home there is a foster father or foster mother, and the children are not educated in a workhouse school, but are sent out to one or two of the national schools in the town, and are not clothed in any distinctive garb; in fact, one of these children in the town would not be known or could not be detected as a workhouse child at all. But one great reason we have for not sending widows with children into the workhouse, if they are able to do at all outside with a little relief, is this fact: that cotton-weaving is the chief industry of the town, and cotton-weaving can only be efficiently learnt by a child going to it at the age of, say, 10 years, whilst the fingers are sensitive and pliable. From 10 years of age up to 18, children that work in the factories work half time, and are half time at school, and at the present time throughout the union there are about 6,500 children working as half-timers. Now, a child who is sent into the workhouse, whilst a resident in the workhouse, cannot learn the industry of the district; the child is precluded by the regulations of the Local Government Board from being sent out as a half-timer; and my board are somewhat alarmed at the proposition—the provision that is being made in the Local Government Bill, for a subvention of 4 d. per day in respect of the in-door poor. They are strongly of opinion that this will act, they will not say as a bribe, but as a very strong inducement for guardians to adopt what some of our board term the "official" view of the question; that, in the administration of relief, it is best to make a very extensive use of the workhouse test. As regards the number who are receiving out-relief, I find, from a return which was made in November 1887 (not long ago), that out of 1,369 persons who were receiving out-relief, 328 were over 70 years of age; between 60 and 70 years of age, 273; and under 16 years of age, children, 494; the percentages being 24 per cent. over 70 years of age; 20 per cent. between 60 and 70 years of age, and 36 per cent. under 16 years of age; making a total, for the three classes, of 80 per cent.; the remaining 20 per cent. being over 16 years of age and under 60; and we find that, in the whole, the system of making rather an extensive use of out-relief is not what has often been termed one of relief in aid of wages, but that it is relief to the deserving poor who are too old to work, and relief given to widows to enable them to tide over a temporary difficulty until their children can obtain work. But we do not pretend for a moment to say that the views of the Burnley Guardians and their practice would be the best for all parts of England,
England, nor do we complain in the main of the regulations of the Local Government Board as regards relief. I think that is a general statement of our views.

3303. Can Burnley he said during the last two years, over which your comparison extended, to have been more prosperous than other Lancashire towns similarly situated?

I think that during the last two years Burnley has enjoyed a very fair share of prosperity; but I do not think more so than other parts of East Lancashire.

3304. You do not think that the somewhat smaller amount of pauperism in Burnley is to be accounted for by there being less poverty in the town?

Undoubtedly, I should say that the 1st of January this year there was less poverty in the district than a year ago, and especially less than two years ago.

3305. I meant as compared with the rest of Lancashire; you do not think that there is any exceptional advantage possessed by Burnley in that respect?

I think not.

3306. Would you kindly describe exactly what course your board pursue; for example, to take the different classes, supposing an aged man applies who is unable to work, with possibly a wife dependent upon him also unable to work, what course do you pursue in that case?

"Unable to work;" by that I take you to mean in regard to continuous employment for wages.

3307. I meant unable to work from age and infirmity, in the strict sense of the word "unable"?

If this old man and woman had made no friends amongst their neighbours, and were unable to take care of themselves in their own cottage, a ticket for the workhouse would be given. Such a case came up a fortnight ago. An old couple, I think the man was about 90, and the wife stated that she was 96 (she did not quite look 96, but, however, she stated so); for some years past this old couple had been receiving out-relief, and had been assisted very largely by their old friends and neighbours, who knew them to be a respectable couple; but they had got to such an age that they were no longer able to attend to their own personal cleanliness, and so on; and a ticket was given for the workhouse, and the two old people live together, and, I believe, are fairly happy there.

3308. If these old people had had some friends who could have helped them, what would you then have done; would you have given something to increase the amount they would have received in that way?

After careful inquiry, we should have supplemented what their friends had provided.

3309. You say careful inquiry; inquiry upon what point?

As to whether they were sober, temperate people; whether they were leading a respectable life in a clean and decent place.

3310. Would you inquire as to whether they would be able, if they were left to themselves, to get sufficient assistance to enable them to go on without receiving relief from the rates?

That would be the first inquiry.

3311. Now, if you had reason to suppose that they could get such assistance, would you then offer the house to those people?

Most certainly.

3312. Now, take the case of an old man who is able to earn a little, but not sufficient to support himself; in that case what course do you pursue?

If his character were good we should give out-relief.

3313. Now, do not you think that that has a direct tendency to lower wages, (70.)

by
by enabling such men to work for very small wages indeed, the rest being provided out of the rates?

I had rather in my mind the case of a man who would not be able to obtain continuous work, that is to say, to go at six in the morning and work until half-past five at night, in a feeble way; but rather a man whose employment would be of an irregular character.

3314. Supposing he were able to work in a feeble way, would you then refuse him out-door relief?

I think we should not. But we have so few cases of that kind, because, if a man is not able to do a good day's work in a mill or a factory, or a foundry, he would have to go.

3315. But I understood you had a certain number of people within the union who are not employed in that way at all?

A fair number.

3316. In that case would there not sometimes be a man who would be earning something daily, but something very small, by odd jobs or in modes of that kind?

Yes.

3317. And if you gave him out-door relief too, would it not rather facilitate getting that man at a cheap rate?

The number of cases of that kind would be so small, that I do not think it would have the slightest effect upon wages.

3318. Now I will put another case. Supposing you had the case of a man who is earning fair wages, but having a large family, and two or three of the children are ill with, perhaps, illnesses which are more or less of a permanent kind, and which involve him in considerable expense; do you give out-door relief in such cases as that?

I have known one or two cases where out-door relief has been given, when the father has had to leave his work for a short period owing to the sickness of his family; but in a few cases we have taken into the workhouse children of that kind.

3319. Are you allowed to take children under age into the workhouse without the head of the family?

No.

3320. Then how could you deal with the case?

We have simply taken them; it has been so exceptional.

3321. But I asked whether you had been allowed by the poor law regulations to take children into the house without their parents?

No.

3322. And, notwithstanding, you have done that?

Occasionally; but it has never been of a permanent character.

3323. Has the auditor passed your expenses?

Yes, we have had no surcharges for several years. I will give you a case. A man's wife died; he was left a widower with three or four children, and was very soon destitute, but our relieving officer thought that the man did not act with pluck, and gave him a ticket for the workhouse. The man went to the workhouse with his children, and certainly the workhouse test in his case was very good; he found that it would be better to be outside than inside; but he had no home, and he had got his children; and the guardians agreed that this man might go out and leave his children for a fortnight, until he could obtain regular work and get a home for his children.

3324. That is rather in the nature of your allowing a man to go out in search of work?

It is something of that kind; but it was a fortnight or three weeks; it was more than a day or two.

3325. You extended the time somewhat beyond the actual time; but the principle
principle was, that you were allowing a respectable man to have an opportunity of obtaining work?

That was so; and in the same way as regards women, who have sometimes to go into the house, we do not want them to stay there with the children, but we say, "Go and seek work, and we will take care of the children for a fortnight or so."

3326. Then, in the case of an able-bodied man who is unable to obtain work, and applies to the board on that ground, do you give him any out-door relief?

Certainly not; the house.

3327. Have you had any exceptional distress during the last few years, and any considerable number of men at one time out of work from any cause?

About three years ago there was, I will not say exceptional distress, but employment in the district was not so good as what it usually is; and I should explain that Burnley Union, on the whole, being a good wage-earning district, attracts a fair number of persons, some legitimately seeking work, no doubt, and others loafers from other districts; because even a vagrant who has to beg prefers naturally a good wage-earning district to a district where all, perhaps, are pretty near as poor as himself. We frequently have cases like the following, which I should like to mention to your Lordships. A widow named Agnes Holgate belonged to the Garstang Union, an agricultural union in West Lancashire. She was left with five children, aged respectively 14, 11, 8, 5, and 3. Now there were two alternatives before that woman in Garstang, either to go into the workhouse with her five children, or to leave the union and come to another where she would have every opportunity of obtaining employment for her children; and, like a wise woman, she preferred the latter alternative and came to Burnley Union. She had not been long in Burnley before, of course, she had to come to the guardians for relief. "But, my good woman," the reply to her question was, "you do not belong to us; you belong to Garstang Union." "Well, it is no good my remaining in Garstang; I cannot find employment there for these children. I have come to Burnley Union, where I hear that juvenile labour is in demand, and I have some friends here, but, unfortunately, not able to help me." Application was then made to the Garstang Union, and they, as we think very properly, allowed her relief; requested us to pay the relief, and said that they would refund it. Our board did not consider the amount that the Garstang Union allowed was sufficient, and, I believe, added 2s. or 3s. a week to it; so that for some little time we did not get the entire amount returned. But in the course of a few months' time the woman obtained full-time employment for the child of 14, the child of 11 became a half-timer, and by the end of this quarter she will need no relief at all from the union, and she and her children will be able to make a fairly good living.

3328. Then the result of that would be, would it not, that out of the rates you assist persons to come into Burnley who compete with your labouring population which are in the union?

I will not go so far as your Lordship and say "to assist competition in labour," but our object is not to spend the rates in the relief of idleness in the workhouse. We say that it is better, if you are to relieve, that you should relieve in such a form as to enable persons to become useful members to the State by being able to earn something for themselves, rather than spending their time as non-producers in the workhouse.

3329. But in the case supposed you were not obliged to relieve the family at all?

That is so; we might have taken the trouble of obtaining a justice's order for their removal to the Garstang Union, and pitchforked them virtually into the workhouse there.

3330. But in the end you thought it better to pitchfork them into your own union?

No; they came there.

(70.) 3 A 331. But
3331. But they could not have remained there, unless they had done so with your money?
But Garstang refunded what we gave.

3332. But you gave something?
We did give a little ourselves for the first quarter, but a less amount than it would have cost us to send them back to Garstang.

3333. The practice which you have described as adopted in that case is one which many think unwise, to give relief out of the union to persons who leave the union; is not such a plan as that one which enables one union to put off its paupers on another union, and to give them relief in that other union, with the prospect that if for a year they receive no relief they become fixed on that union; are you aware that many persons think that an unwise system?
Yes, many persons think so; and as regards the granting of relief to paupers who have gone to another union, I think the persons who object the most are the men in like positions with myself, namely, clerks to guardians; because it certainly costs entail a vast amount of correspondence and book-keeping with reference to those persons. If we had seen that this case of which I have spoken, the Holygate case, would have drifted into the permanent ranks of pauperism, or appeared to do so, we should certainly not have retained them.

3334. Now would you explain what is your usual course with regard to a respectable widow applying with four or five young children; do you require her to support two of them, or what is your usual practice?
Careful inquiry would be made first of all. We should ask, “Now, what do you propose to do for yourself? You have got these children; what do you propose to do?” She may find it best to stay at home and take in a little washing, or a little sewing, and probably will represent that in the course of a little time she will be able to get her children employed as half-timers.

3335. How many children would you require her to support out of five children, and none of them earning anything, or being of an age to earn anything?
Probably in a case like that we should give 7s. or 10s. per week.

3336. But you do not make any calculation as to the number of children that, if she can get employment for herself, she can fairly be required to support?
That would be taken into consideration; but I could not speak as to the number that the guardians would require.

3337. You do not say that if she is an able-bodied woman she would be required to support two children?
That must vary considerably as regards the circumstances. For instance, a child 10 months old would require the mother’s time a great deal more than a child able to run about or go to school.

3338. Do you require her to support any of her children?
Yes.

3339. My question is directed to this: would you give relief to the whole five, or would your relief be calculated for four, or three, or what number?
If the widow were able-bodied we should certainly require her to do something; I could not say whether to support two or three children.

3340. But you must have some ordinary practice. If a woman has five children and is unable to support them, for how many children would you reckon to give relief; there must be some number that you reckon?
That would depend very materially as regards the age of the children and the mother’s earnings.

3341. No doubt it depends upon the age of the children; but I will suppose
the age of the children to be under 10, and then I will suppose an average case; you cannot absolutely of course adjust it to every possible case; but what would be your ordinary practice; would you calculate your relief as sufficient for three of the children, or four of the children, or how would you calculate it? I think we would go as far as three.

3342. Then, in fact, as a general practice, you would leave two to be supported by the woman? That is so; but that would depend very materially upon the physical strength of the mother, and any assistance from friends.

3343. I am speaking of the general practice? In an average case it would be so.

3344. Then it must be sometimes the case in Burnley that the home which the widow can obtain is a very unsatisfactory one, and not one in which children can be well brought up; is not that sometimes the case? Undoubtedly.

3345. Do you take that into consideration? That is taken into consideration.

3346. And if you found that the circumstances of the home were such as to make it improbable that the children would be brought up decently, should you then refuse out-door relief? Most certainly. We have cases of that kind in the workhouse at the present time.

3347. Have you ever considered the practice, which is pursued in some unions in the metropolis certainly, of requiring the widow to give up to the guardians so many of the children as she cannot support, and placing those children in your cottage homes? Occasionally we have done that.

3348. Should you see any serious objection to such a system administered in this way, for instance, in Burnley, that the children would remain in the cottage home till they were 10, and if then they could obtain employment as half-timers, they would return to their mother? We are of opinion that the best cottage home, or the best workhouse school, is not equal on the whole to home training; that it is better for a mother and her children to be together; that even in the best cottage home the training more or less is of a mechanical nature; and therefore, even as regards the children in our cottage homes, I am very pleased to say that after they had been there, say, a couple of years or so, and have become 10 years of age, we can very frequently find them homes with persons engaged in the weaving industry, who will take these children; perhaps they had known the father or mother of the child, or there has been some friendly tie, and they take them and teach them weaving along with themselves.

3349. Are those children whom you board out, or are they children whom you maintain in homes without relief? In homes, but without any relief. As a rule we have very little difficulty, with the girls, in finding homes; we do not board out any.

3350. Your board prefer the system of cottage homes to boarding out? I take it so, by the erection of cottage homes. We have six, and at the present time only three are occupied.

3351. Have you any children in the workhouse besides those whom you have placed in your cottage homes? Yes; I think they are under three years of age.

3352. Do you send to your cottage homes children who come in with parents (70.)
parents who are only probably temporarily in the workhouse; are they all sent to cottage homes?

After a few days' probation in the receiving ward, if they are above three, they would be sent to cottage homes.

3353. Do you suffer any inconvenience at Burnley from that class which is popularly known as ins-and-outs, men or women who have a habit of coming in for a day or two, going out again, and so forth?

Not to the same extent as in many unions. We are troubled with some, especially who want a day's leave. "You cannot have it," they are told. "All right, I will take my discharge," and they will come back in a week; but taking it on the whole, I do not think we are troubled to any great extent.

3354. Are you much troubled with the cases of women coming in for the purpose of lying-in with illegitimate children?

I think that is on the increase; they find that the infirmary, the medical attendance, and the diet, and so on, are so good, that I think it is being made use of to a greater extent than I have known it before, and I have a suspicion myself that in deserted cases it is often a made up matter between the man and his wife, "Now I will go off, ostensibly in search of work, and you can go in there."

3355. You used the expression in one of your answers, "deserving poor;" now how, with regard to the Poor Law, which is the subject of our inquiry, do you define "deserving poor"?

A man or a woman who has lived a sober, temperate life, may have been unfortunate, or may have had a large family, and their nose continually at the grindstone, and have not been able to save anything, and have come into distress.

3356. I suppose your wages are tolerably high in Burnley?

I think on the whole it is a good wage-earning district, probably as good as any in the world.

3357. Now do you think that a man who has earned wages all his life in this district which you describe as being as good as any in the world, and who, when he becomes old comes to the board for relief from the rates, having saved nothing during his whole life from his good wages, is a deserving man?

There is a certain period of a man's life, when he can earn, with himself and his family good wages; but unfortunately in Lancashire the boys and girls marry at rather an early age, and he is left in narrow circumstances with age creeping on, perhaps the wage that he is earning has to be supplemented by his savings which are now come to an end. That we should say was a deserving case.

3358. But now, does not your system of rather extensive out-door relief tend directly to encourage a population such as yours, which might save out of its large wages, throwing themselves ultimately upon the rates?

We think the results show the reverse of that; for, as I pointed out before, whereas in 1878 we had one pauper in 55, in 1888, ten years afterwards, we have one in 69.

3359. But then that might be due, I apprehend, to a variety of causes; and what I should like to ask you is this: are you prepared to say that your Board is of opinion that if you administer the Poor Law more strictly, as regards out-door relief, you might not come down considerably below the figure of one in 69.

Your meaning is, that if we had a more rigid rule as regards out-relief, probably this 1 in 69 might be 1 in 80, say.

3360. Is the position you take up based upon your contention, that a stricter system of out-door relief would seriously affect the younger part of the population obtaining a knowledge of their trade?

Very much so. The conditions of labour in the district are such, that a very large number of juveniles are employed; I think I said about 6,500, out of an estimated population of 150,000.

3361. You
3361. You would not, I suppose, deny that your system must tend to discourage saving?
I do not know that it must to any greater extent than in-door relief; for it is
a common expression, when a person applies for relief, even in the case of those
who get the ticket for the workhouse, "I am entitled to it; I have paid rates so
long."

3362. But is it not the case in Burnley, as elsewhere, that, as a rule, the
poor have a much greater distaste for the workhouse, and naturally, than to
out-door relief?
That is so, undoubtedly.

3363. Then does it not follow almost conclusively, that what people have a
greater distaste for, they would be more unwilling to resort to, and therefore if
they could only obtain, or generally could only obtain, relief in the workhouse,
they would not resort to relief from the rates; does not that follow?
I think that is, perhaps, a fair inference.

3364. But I think your views are fairly stated thus: that you think any
such considerations or arguments are over balanced by the advantages which
your system offers of keeping the whole population in full employment by
giving the children time to obtain a knowledge of their trade, and also to get
employment?
That is so. We do not say that our out-relief could be applied with advantage
to the entire country; we say, Let the guardians of each district judge for
themselves, without undue pressure from the Local Government Board, or
pressure by this inducement of the fourpence a day for the in-door poor.

3365. I suppose you anticipate that if that fourpence be given there will
almost inevitably be a disposition to restrict the out-door relief?
The tendency will be in that direction. We have ourselves, by petition, sug-
gested that, instead of fourpence per day for the in-door poor, the maintenance
of lunatics should be taken over by the State, because you cannot manufacture
lunatics. Of course I could give other typical cases of out-door relief, if
required.

3366. Is there any other point upon which you would like to give us any
information to which I have not referred in the questions I have put to you?
I do not know that there is. I do not know whether this would be of any
service: Take, for the year 1887, the cost for the in-door poor maintenance,
and the amount that is dispensed for out-relief: I will take Burnley Union, Lan-
cashire, and England and Wales. In the Burnley Union the cost of in main-
tenance in 1887 was 3,276 l., which, divided amongst 381 persons, about the
mean number, gives a cost of 8 l. 12 s. per annum. In the county of Lancaster
the cost of in-maintenance was 201,534 l. amongst 25,619 persons, the cost per
head being therefore: 7 l. 17 s. 3 d., about 15 s. therefore less than the Burnley
in-maintenance, which would probably be due to our extra expenditure on our
cottage homes. Taking England and Wales, the cost of in-maintenance was
1,799,914 l., which, divided amongst 201,698, gives a cost of in-maintenance of
8 l. 18 s. 5 d., or about the same as, a few shillings more than, that of Burnley.
Now we come to the amount disbursed for out-relief; and it is a contention
that where the in-door relief is very largely resorted to, the out-door relief also
falls down to a very great extent. In out-door relief in 1887, we disbursed
8,431 l., which is about 5 l. 3 s. 7 d. per head. The out-relief for the county
was 185,676 l., or about 3 l. 11 s. per head; and for the entire country the
amount was 2,516,755 l., or about 4 l. 8 s. 8 d. per head. So that as regards
the amount per head for out-relief, we are higher than either the county or
England and Wales.

3367. Have you any labour-yard at Burnley for the employment of paupers?
We have not a distinctive labour-yard; but an able-bodied man who may be
temporarily relieved on account of his family, or his own circumstances with
out-door relief, would be sent to labour at the workhouse, and some test would
be applied there.
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3368. Earl
3368. Earl of Onslow.] I presume you would say that it is an attribute of the deserving poor, if they receive a sum of money in case of old age or sickness from a benefit society. You would consider that if a man receive a sum of money from a benefit society which would yet not be enough fully to maintain him, he would be what you call one of the deserving poor?

Most certainly.

3369. Then what is your practice in the case of a man who receives a small sum of money from a benefit society which is not sufficient to support him; do you supplement that?

I do not know of many cases that have occurred of that kind; almost the entire number of cases of that kind, I think, are cases of lunatics, and it depends upon the rules of the society as to whether we get any portion; if we possibly can, we obtain the relief that would have gone to the man if he had not been a lunatic.

3370. But has there never come within your knowledge at Burnley the case of a man who receives a very small sum of money, and is unable to support himself upon it?

A few; I have had cases of this kind, where a man has deserted, or neglected to maintain his family, and then we have taken action at once to obtain the payment of some part of his pension for the relief of his family.

3371. Chairman.] Are Burnley operatives, as far as you know, in the habit of becoming members of benefit societies to any large extent?

I think not to any great extent. I think they have a weaver's union, or something of that kind; for trade purposes, but I could not say positively whether it is also a benefit society in times of sickness.

3372. Earl of Onslow.] Do you think that the practice which you adopt of granting out-door relief has any influence in discouraging insurance in benefit societies?

No; because a very large amount, I believe, is subscribed for insurance, but it is generally for after death. There is quite an army of insurance agents, who gather a few pence per week; and a great number of the operatives seem to have a very strong desire that they shall have what is termed a decent burial, and it is very frequently the case that after a person has died in our workhouse infirmary, some of their friends have obtained the insurance money, and the funeral is perhaps rather more than decent.

3373. But may it not be that knowing that they will have a decent maintenance in old age from out-door relief, they are inclined to insure, as you say, for a decent burial, rather than for maintenance in old age?

I do not imagine that they think about that, and it is by no means certain that they would receive out-relief.

3374. Chairman.] Is it not rather a singular coincidence that whereas the membership of the labouring class in benefit clubs is very general in many parts of England, just in a district where out-door relief is so willingly given, this system does not prevail?

I think the expression "willingly given" is rather too strong, when you consider what I said before, that a large number of our recipients of relief are widows and children. Of course, the husbands might have made provision by insurance; but I cannot speak with sufficiently definite knowledge as to the number that insure.

3375. Take the case that must occur in Burnley as elsewhere, of a man who is able-bodied becoming ill; do those persons generally come on the rates, in your opinion, or are they in a position, from any trade union or benefit club, to support themselves during sickness?

We have not a great number of cases of that kind; they rely either on the help of friends, or upon the aid of the shopkeeper; but it is by no means unfrequent that contributions will be made from the persons working at the looms of so much a week to help each other; and, taking the district as a whole,
whole, there is a great amount of thrift, and perhaps the best evidence of that is the fine position which the Burnley Building Society takes, with a capital of half a million, and the spread of co-operative societies.

3376. And probably considerable deposits in savings banks?
I have no doubt that is so; but unfortunately it is the case in all good wage-earning districts that there are a certain number of "ne'er-do-wwels," and a certain number who have lived a fairly decent life but who cannot keep money in their pockets; it dribbles away.

3377. Lord Thring.] Is there any Charity Organisation Society in Burnley?
No; in fact I do not think that, except persons who regularly read newspapers, our people have ever heard of such a thing as a Charity Organisation Society. I think perhaps two or three years ago we heard something about it. They sent down a man and his family to Burnley; they were utterly unfitted for the district, and, at considerable expense, we had to send them back to London. The Charity Organisation Society sent them down, so the man stated; he was connected with horses, a groom or something of that kind. That is the only connection we have ever had with the London Charity Organisation Society.

3378. But then I ask you a general question: are you so prosperous that there are no charitable societies at all in Burnley, no district visiting societies and so forth?
Oh, yes, in connection with some of the churches, but I do not think it is in a very organised state. I believe it would be all the better if those societies had a little organisation, and made application a little oftener to the relieving officer for information. The Victoria Hospital, supported very largely by operatives, has been of great service in relief of the rates.

3379. You are perhaps aware that we have had a great deal of evidence here of the great advantage of communication and co-operation, so to speak, between charitable societies, whether you call them organisation societies, or by any other name, and the Poor Law; there is no such co-operation or communication in Burnley, as I gather from you?
There is not.

3380. Then the general rule is for the churches or the religious societies to distribute their charity indiscriminately, you think?
I think they might exercise greater discrimination; I do not like to speak harshly, and say that they distribute it indiscriminately; but I think they might do better.

3381. Then, on the whole, it seems to me, that charity plays very little part in Burnley; you are so prosperous that you do not require it?
Yes.

3382. The Poor Law grants all the relief necessary for the district?
It certainly does; in some cases charity perhaps ought to have relieved cases that we have relieved.

3383. Do you not think it would have been better if, instead of giving so much out-door relief, you could have organised some charitable society to supplement poor-law relief, so as to diminish the out-door relief?
The guardians would be very pleased indeed if others would take up that kind of work to help them.

3384. But, as a matter of fact, they do not?
That is so; they do not; and the charity that is dispensed will be chiefly amongst those who attend particular churches; that is to say, every church looks after, more or less, its own poor.

3385. The charity being given as part of the religious organisation?
More or less, that is so.

3386. Earl of Strafford.] Has there been much immigration from the rural districts into Burnley during the last two or three years, of unemployed labourers and that class of persons?
I think that is so; but not entirely from rural districts.
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And have you been able to find work for them, or have you generally endeavoured to pass them on?

I think the greater part have found work.

And with regard to foreigners, has there been much addition in Burnley of foreign workmen and labourers, or people of that kind?

I do not know a single case.

You have had none?

No.

You know that has been the great complaint of the East-end of London; but you have not suffered from that in Lancashire?

I should very much question whether we have had a single case.

And do you think what you say as regards Burnley applies to the other large towns of Lancashire; that there has been no immigration of foreign competition in the shape of labour?

I should think not, unless it would be in Manchester, and I have not heard that it has taken place to any appreciable extent even there.

At any rate the amount of it has not been sufficient to cause any great discontent?

No.

Lord Thring.] With regard to this peculiar system, or rather this peculiarity which appears to prevail so much in Burnley, the necessity of teaching children weaving, I think you said at a very early age, is that confined, as far as you know, to the Burnley Union, or does it extend to other parts of Lancashire?

There are a considerable number of half-timers, children who begin work at the age of 10, and are employed in the unions of Blackburn and Oldham. I should think that the unions of Oldham, Blackburn, and Burnley are the largest employers of this kind of labour in the kingdom.

And those unions are subject to the same conditions, so to speak, in your opinion, as Burnley?

Very much the same.

You are not aware whether they pursue the same system?

I think that perhaps our proportion of out-relief is greater than it is in either Blackburn or Oldham.

And may I ask a question with respect to weaving; it is my ignorance, but I do not quite understand what you mean really by weaving; you say a child must be taught weaving; what does that really extend to; what trade?

Cotton. A piece of calico requires to be woven; it has got a weft and a warp, and a shuttle goes through.

Are more children employed in that industry than in others?

The number of children employed in any other industry will bear no comparison with the large number employed in cotton-weaving.

Chairman.] Have you any industry besides weaving in Burnley?

Yes; but at Nelson it is more of a mixed trade. That is to say, they can take either the Lancashire trade, cotton-weaving, or the Bradford trade, worsted, or mix them. For instance, Mr. Ecroyd, formerly Member for Preston, has large works in the Burnley Union, at a place near Nelson.

Children are allowed to be employed in that also, are they?

Yes.

Lord Thring.] What wages can they get?

I have known cases where a boy or a girl between 14 and 15 years of age has been able to become so skilful as to attend to four looms, and earn 18s. per week.
3401. Chairman.] But when they first begin, what can they make? Three shillings or 3s. 6d. per week.

3402. You said that in 1888 the proportion in Burnley of paupers to population on the 1st of January was 1 in 69. Now, seeing that in some by no means wealthy unions in London the proportion was considerably less in 1888 on the 1st of January per 1,000 of the population, notwithstanding that we are told that there has been some exceptional distress in London, do you not think in a prosperous town, such as you describe Burnley to be, the proportion per 1,000 is very high?

The proportion per 1,000 of the population in the Burnley Union is 14½, and is certainly higher than the guardians like. This is based upon the population of 1881, but the population of our union has increased so rapidly that, if calculated upon the estimated population of to-day, would not be more than 1 in 87 or 12 per 1,000 of the population.

3403. You perhaps cannot give us the number that were relieved on the 1st of July 1887, which, of course, would be different from that on the 1st of January, and perhaps give us a fairer notion of the total result?

I think I can. I merely took the 1st of January 1888 because it was from the latest Return of the Local Government Board. It so happens that on the 1st of July 1887 we had rather more; the total was 1,776 as against 1,725 on the 1st of January 1888.

3404. It appears, therefore, that if I took the mean between the two periods, as is taken in the Return which I have here of the London unions, the figures would about hold good of 1 in 69?

Yes; that is to say, taking the 1881 population.

3405. Upon the census of 1881?

Yes.

3406. Upon this census of 1881 I find that the ratio per 1,000 of population in the whole of London is 24½, and in a few of the unions it is less. Now I repeat my question: do you think it is a satisfactory result that in so prosperous a place as Burnley there should be a higher rate of pauperism than in some of the unions in London, which are probably not better situated?

In the metropolis there are 30 unions or parishes; and from an official return I find that on the 1st of January 1888 there were (excluding lunatics, vagrants, and patients in fever and small-pox hospitals) 98,648 paupers, being 25½ per 1,000 of the population, whereas in the Burnley Union on the same day the ratio was 14½ per 1,000, and there were only two unions in the metropolis, namely, Hampstead and Paddington, with a less number of paupers per 1,000 of population than the Burnley Union, and these two unions were only about 3 per 1,000 better than Burnley; further, in the East-end of London you have a large amount of poverty (I can scarcely call it pauperism, because they are not in receipt of relief). In the Burnley Union, deducting the paupers from the entire population, we have comparatively little poverty.

3407. Would not that strengthen my position; would it not therefore follow that whereas there is, taken absolutely on your showing, a greater amount of poverty in the London unions, yet in the Burnley Union, with a less amount of poverty in the population there is a greater amount of pauperism?

No, my Lord; the pauperism of the Burnley Union is much less than in the metropolis, being 14½ per 1,000 of the population, as against 25½ in the metropolis.

3408. But with a less amount of poverty there is a great amount of pauperism; is not that so?

I do not know whether I make myself sufficiently understood.

3409. Perhaps I have not made myself understood to you; shall I repeat the question; I understood you to say that, as far as you could judge from what you have heard, there was outside the pauper population of London, that is, outside the population receiving relief, a greater number of poor people, people in an impoverished condition, than there is in Burnley?

Yes, my Lord.
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3410. Then,
3410. Then, I ask, is not the conclusion this: that, whereas in Burnley there are a smaller number of people who are in an impoverished condition than in London, there is in Burnley a larger pauper population than in some of the London unions; that is, more pauperism?

After we have relieved the destitute, as we are bound to do, then we have a less amount of poverty than in many of the London unions, which largely apply the workhouse test in the relief of destitution; but I desire to point out to your Lordships that the increase in the population of the Burnley Union is probably greater than that of any other union in the kingdom; and, therefore, figures or deductions based upon the 1881 census are, perhaps, scarcely fair.

3411. But even making a fair deduction for that, can you deny that the result would be that it shows that Burnley has a higher proportion as regards pauperism as compared with parts of London; and yet it can hardly be argued that its population is on the whole poorer?

I can quite understand that if a ticket for the workhouse were offered as freely in Burnley as it is in Whitechapel, we should have a very much less number of paupers, but I do not think our poverty would be less, and the parts of London, namely, Paddington and Hampstead, that you compare with Burnley are certainly not industrial centres in the same sense as Burnley.

3412. Earl of Onslow.] Is it not then, according to your own showing, a fact that whereas there are in London a large number of people who, more or less apparently, perhaps, are able to support themselves and do not come upon the rates, that same class in Burnley is relieved at the expense of the rates?

No, the inference I draw from London is this: that outside the recipients of relief there are thousands who are existing, simply existing; they are not living.

3413. But those same thousands are persons who in Burnley would come within that circle which you relieve at the expense of the rates?

If they were destitute we should be bound to relieve them, and would have to ask ourselves the question, "What is the wisest course to take; to give the relief in the workhouse, or to give it as out-relief?" And we do not say that the circumstances of Burnley as regards our large percentage of out-door poor could be well applied to London. We have this advantage over London and the large towns, that most of our cases are known, the individual life is known, but you could not possibly know them in the same way in a densely populated district like that of London.

3414. Chairman.] What is the population of the town part of Burnley Union, do you know?

To-day it would be about 75,000 to 80,000.

3415. Is that less densely populated than similar districts in London?

Certainly. We have very few three-storey houses; our operatives and our people chiefly live in cottages that have not more than two or three bedrooms.

3416. You mean that per acre there is not so large a population in Burnley?

Yes.

3417. But my question bore upon your statement that most of the cases are well known in Burnley, and perhaps you can explain to us (you can do so satisfactorily, no doubt) how it happens that in a town with 70,000 like Burnley a case is generally known, and we are told in similar populations in London the cases are not known?

For this reason: the population not being so dense per acre, most persons know their neighbours. I frankly admit this, that in proportion as we have used the workhouse test we have diminished the number of paupers, but I will not say it is due solely to that; it may be due also to better trade.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
Mr. THOMAS CHARLES JONES, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

3418. Chairman. I think you are a Member of the Board of Guardians in Marylebone?
St. Marylebone; and also I have been for many years in St. Pancras, 20 years altogether as a guardian, principally engaged in the administration of out-door relief.

3419. You are Chairman, I think, at present of the committee of out-door relief in Marylebone?
I am.

3420. Could you explain to us what your practice is with regard to out-door relief generally, that is to say, taking different classes of persons, aged and infirm sick persons and widows, how you deal with those cases respectively as a general rule?
I may state that we have no hard-and-fast line; we endeavour to deal with every case fairly upon its merits, and in the case of widows with children, which your Lordship has already mentioned, I may state that the practice there some years ago was carried out almost exclusively of taking children away from the widow and sending them to the pauper schools.

3421. That is to say, your district schools?
District schools. The committee have, during the last few years, found that it would be better in the case of a respectable widow that she should have the charge of her children, and we do not now adopt that system, only in exceptional cases where the widow is not to be trusted with the care of the children, and when she is intemperate; and I am strongly of opinion, from my experience during 20 years, that it is better that the mother should have the care of her children inasmuch as from having been on the Schools' Committee for many years, I find that the monotonous life which they lead within the four walls of a pauper school appears to blunt their natural senses; they become dull and stupid, and also sluggish in their habits.

3422. Do you think that there is any difference with regard to the two systems in discouraging, or otherwise, applications for relief?
I think not.

3423. You think on the whole that there would be as many widows probably asking for and requiring relief under the one system as under the other?
Quite so. In some cases they have asked for the admission of their children in preference.

3424. So that the two systems must be judged, not on the question of whether one or the other tends to discourage pauperism, but rather upon the question of whether one or the other is the best for the children?
Quite so. As an inducement, I do not think it is very material; I consider that it does not affect the cases very much.

3425. You do not find that requiring them to be sent to school tends to diminish the number of cases materially of persons applying for relief?
No, it does not.

3426. You say that, having had experience of both systems?
Of both systems.

3427. To go on to the case of persons temporarily sick; do you give them out-door relief, as a rule?
In the case of the bread-earner of the family being seriously ill (it would depend a great deal upon the medical certificate) we generally send him to the infirmary as far the best course, rather than give him out-door relief.

3428. But if it is a temporary sickness, which however precludes the man from earning anything, do you give him out-door relief?
Not in many cases; and that will depend entirely upon the medical certificate.

(70.) 3 b 2 3429. Do
3429. Do you make any difference on the ground that the man is receiving anything from a benefit club; does that affect your decision; I am supposing, of course, a case where he is not receiving sufficient to support himself?

We have often cases of that class, but we find the assistance they generally get comes from the clergy of some church they are connected with, and we find it applies more to aged widows or single persons who are not able to earn quite sufficient to maintain themselves owing to the precarious nature of their work. Of course they cannot work is the principle. When they cannot earn sufficient to maintain themselves, the clergy sometimes supplement it and then recommend them to us for a little assistance.

3430. Do you give assistance in such cases?
We should in a few instances, exceptional cases.

3431. But, speaking generally, do you approve of giving small doles of relief in aid of small wages.

No, we do not.

3432. You would, perhaps, agree that that has a tendency rather to lower wages, and to make the relief merely relief in aid of wages?

No doubt, in principle it would.

3433. But going back to the question whether you give anything in addition to what is received from a benefit club, where the sum received does not appear to be sufficient to maintain the family, do you ever add anything?

We should do, in exceptional cases where they are strongly recommended to us; but that is rather the exception than the rule.

3434. Have you now, or have you had, a labour yard in Marylebone?

We opened a labour yard to meet the exceptional distress during the winter, but it was more under the control of the vestry than of the guardians, and the regulations we made applied to cases of persons who had been resident in the parish for some months, who had homes, which we wished, of course, to preserve, and persons who had not been in the workhouse.

3435. What was the employment?

Stone-breaking; and that would naturally be paid as honest labour out of the funds of the vestry.

3436. Were they paid the full price which a man would earn at stone-breaking?

No, they were not; they were paid piece-work, and, I think, the minimum amount was 1 s. 6 d. a day.

3437. Do you think a man could earn, at the rate you gave, as much as a similar man would earn as ordinary wages?

He could not.

3438. It was fixed below, in fact?

Much below.

3439. Have you any reason to think that there have been cases of impostors amongst those who have gone to the labour yard, as we are told there have been in some other parts of London?

I do not think, with the system adopted in Marylebone, we had any cases, because the small amount that they earn and the heavy work that they have to undergo, would certainly deter impostors from applying to the yard.

3440. Supposing that instead of a labour-yard, and assuming you had room for them, you had offered the house to all these men, do you think they would have taken an order for the house?

I think they would; there were cases that we thoroughly investigated. I may state that the relief committee, over which I preside generally, sit for four or five hours at a time; that shows the amount of care and attention and investigation which we give to the cases.

3441. Have you had every year a labour-yard, or only this last year?

Only this last year or two, during the exceptional distress in the winter.

3442. Had
3442. Had you in Marylebone, last year, an exceptional number of persons out of work during the winter?
   The numbers were not very large.
3443. What class of labourers would they mostly belong to?
   Almost every trade.
3444. Painters probably?
   Painters and carpenters, and so on.
3445. Does it not occur to you that these men probably earn quite sufficient wages in summer to enable them to provide for their maintenance in the winter?
   According to the evidence which the Committee has had placed before them from time to time, I find that there is no doubt that for a short period they earn good wages, but they are so frequently out of work that, taking the whole amount for a year, it would not be sufficient.
3446. Now, of course, if these men would have come into the workhouse they would have fallen upon the rates in any case; but, supposing, what is certainly stated to us in many parishes, that they would not have accepted relief in the house, then it follows, does it not, that you are aiding in keeping down their wages in summer; would not that be so?
   To a certain extent it would.
3447. Do you think there is great danger of labour-yards having that effect?
   Not for the short period that they are kept open.
3448. Have you had a labour-yard for two successive years, or only one year?
   Two winters, for a short period.
3449. Did you find the same men who had come to the labour-yard the first winter, come back again the next winter?
   We did not.
3450. Do you think that there has been any special influx of agricultural labourers into your union during the last two years?
   Not very much in St. Marylebone.
3451. Of course there will be always some coming in, but you have not remarked anything in that way?
   Not anything remarkable.
3452. Do you board out any children?
   Very few.
3453. But some?
   We have a few.
3454. Have you been satisfied with the result?
   We have not been satisfied with some of the cases we visited; the supervision was not such as we liked. No doubt the boarding-out system would be better than district schools if guardians had sufficient control and supervision over them.
3455. You are not satisfied with what you have heard of the supervision of such children when they are sent to a distance in order to be boarded out?
   I am not satisfied that being left without any supervision at all from the guardians, the system would work satisfactorily; I think that the guardians should have the same supervision over them as they have over the children in their district schools.
3456. But if the guardians were to keep a very strict supervision over the children boarded out, would not that tend to defeat the object by making them feel that they were paupers?
   I think that the guardians would exercise greater care in seeing that the children were properly cared for than ordinary committees, who have no interest and no responsibility.
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3457. Were
3457. Were these children who were boarded out at some distance from London?

At Esher.

3458. And you are rather disposed to give up the system, I gather?

I will not go so far as to say that we should give it up, but we rather feel this: that if we had proper supervision, and could investigate the cases and see that they were properly cared for, we think the system would be better than in district schools.

3459. But it would be impossible for the guardians of Marylebone to supervise the children if they were placed at a great distance from them?

I think it would be possible for them to have some supervision, in the way of a sub-committee occasionally.

3460. That would, however, imply that they were within some reasonable reach of London?

It would.

3461. Have you had any experience of casual wards in Marylebone?

Not very much.

3462. Have you ever considered whether it would be desirable, as some people suggest, to put an end to casual wards, and to take all persons whatever into the workhouse?

I have never gone into that question; that is, of course, a modern suggestion, and I think it is a matter that requires a great deal of consideration.

3463. Has there been any support, in your opinion, of persons applying for relief by their relations to any great extent?

Frequently.

3464. You have been, I suppose, active in making inquiries in those cases?

Always. We have an excellent staff of relieving officers, and in no instance do we entertain an application till we have investigated the whole of the case, as regards what friends and relatives they have.

3465. From the return I have before me of the number of paupers in your union on the 1st of July 1887, and the 1st of January 1888, I see that the mean number of in-door paupers is 177, and out-door paupers 59, which is considerably less than the average of out-door paupers, and more than the average of the in-door paupers in the unions in London. I may infer from that, I presume, that on the whole you administer the law strictly; your out-door relief is limited in amount, and is only granted in such cases as you think are an exception to the general rule?

Yes, that is the case. I am also a strong advocate that in new cases the relief should be in kind rather than in money; it is a fair test.

3466. Have you never found that when you give the relief in kind practically, the goods supplied are sold and converted into money?

Very seldom.

3467. You think it operates as a good test?

As a good test, in the first instance.

3468. But I think I may fairly infer that you are by no means in favour of anything approaching to an indiscriminate system of out-door relief?

Certainly I am not.

3469. But you think that while the in-door relief should be offered in the majority of cases, there ought to be in certain cases out-door relief given in order to avoid breaking up the home, or for other reasons?

I am strongly of that opinion. I do not believe in the total abolition of out-door relief; I believe it a valuable auxiliary to the present Poor Law administration, if properly and carefully administered.

3470. If out-door relief were practically abolished, might it not give rise to a hostile feeling on the part of the poor population to the administration of the Poor Law?

I am rather inclined to think that the ratepayers would object to it.
Mr. Jones.

3471. On what ground?
On the score of inhumanity.

3472. Have you any charitable organisation in Marylebone?
We have, and the secretary is a member of my committee.

3473. So that you have a constant communication between the poor law authorities and the charitable organisation?
That is so; and the relieving officers, when they bring up a new case, are instructed to examine the files of the Charity Organisation Society before they place the case before the relief committee.

3474. If you find a case which, in your opinion, is not one for relief from the rates, but one which is a proper one for relief from charity, do you make it known to the charitable organisation?
We refer it; we make a special order. "Refer to the Charity Organisation Society" will be the order.

3475. Are you of opinion that that communication between the two different organisations is advantageous to both?
It is invaluable, no doubt.

3476. Earl of Onslow. You do not think that the existing supervision of the Local Government Board over boarded-out children is sufficient?
I do not think it is sufficient.

3477. Do you think that any extension of the Local Government Board's supervision would meet the requirements which you deem necessary?
I think so.

3478. As well as that of the guardians themselves?
Probably it might. What I feel now is, that of course accounts of such cases as those that took place at Denmead, where 100 children were boarded out from St. Pancras (they found them in such a deplorable condition that they were at once ordered home back to the schools), show the necessity of better supervision; and that supervision should be in the hands of the guardians, who are responsible to the ratepayers.

3479. But as far as the principle of boarding out goes, you approve of it?
I approve of it as superior to a district school. As I have already stated, I have a strong objection to children being brought up in the district schools; they remain there longer than they ought to; and in the case of the girls a very large number turn out unsatisfactorily; they have nothing but domestic service before them, owing to the defects of the training they receive. I should advocate more technical training. They invariably leave their situations in the first month, and they drift back into the schools or go to their friends, and some of the older girls become permanent paupers in the workhouse.

3480. Chairman. Is there anything you would like to add to your evidence?
Another point I should like to mention particularly is, that I am strongly of opinion that the guardians should have the power of longer detention in the workhouse. I am very sorry to state that we have every week a most deplorable sight to see able-bodied young men at the age of 18, who have now drifted into the habit of going into the workhouse two or three times a week; it is simply an oscillation between the public-house on the one hand and the workhouse on the other.

3481. What increased powers of detention would you think desirable?
That would depend in a great measure upon the character of the persons under consideration, and the number of times they have been in the habit of going into the workhouse.

3482. What increased powers do you think ought to be given by law?
A longer power of detention.

3483. How long?
That would be a matter for consideration.
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3484. It has been suggested to us by one witness that in all cases the detention should be for a week, and in cases where the going in and out had been frequent it should extend to as long as a month; what do you say to that suggestion?

I strongly endorse that opinion.

3485. Do you think that it would be right to make it a rigid rule that no discharge of any pauper should take place under a week; would it not be necessary to leave a discretion with the guardians?

A discretionary power with the master, which he always has.

3486. But in the case supposed he would not have it; but you would think it would be necessary to vest a discretionary power in the master, subject to the guardians, to discharge sooner for special reasons?

Certainly.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Reverend JOHN F. KITTO (Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields), is called in; and Examined, as follows:

3487. Chairman.] I think you were Chairman of a Committee who were assembled for the purpose of considering a system of casual wards in London?

Yes; that is to say, it was a committee which grew out of the difficulty which we had in the centre of London, Trafalgar-square, which is the centre of all difficulties, last summer. We found a small number of persons, to begin with, taking their lodgings in the open air. It was gradually increased as the summer went on and notice was attracted to it, and as charitable persons came in order to distribute money and food, until at the end of the autumn it came to be a matter of 400 or 500 persons assembling there every night in order to get what they could get. Of course that became a difficulty which we did not quite see our way of dealing with, and with the help of the police, first of all, it was arranged that the tickets which had been distributed in Trafalgar-square should be distributed at the nearest casual wards instead; that is to say, that practically the crowd assembled in Trafalgar-square was distributed, and persons were prohibited from remaining in Trafalgar-square. That, of course, was a police regulation. Then the question was, how to deal with them when they got to the casual wards.

3488. In what way were these tickets given?

They were tickets given by charitable persons for lodgings for the homeless and outcasts. They attracted, as every indiscriminate distribution of any thing will attract, a large number of persons from all parts of the metropolis in order to see what they could get.

3489. They were not connected in any way with the administration of the Poor Law?

They were not at all, but they became connected with the administration of the Poor Law when, by the license of the guardians of these casual wards, they were distributed by the police at the doors of the casual wards, instead of being distributed by benevolent persons in Trafalgar-square. Then I brought the matter before the public, and those who took an interest in the subject wrote to me about it and offered their services, and we formed ourselves into a committee to co-operate with the guardians on the one hand, and the Charity Organisation Society on the other, and we got a small fund together, and we set to work to investigate the cases of persons who came for lodgings to the casual wards, starting with the assumption that there were persons, at any rate in a time of exceptional pressure, who were driven to apply for help to the casual wards, whom it would be desirable to rescue from the casual wards, for whom the casual wards, which are penal, are not really intended.

3490. Might I, before you go further into the subject, ask you whether you are of opinion that there was any necessity for these tickets?

That
That may land me in a difficulty, unless I explain. I do not think that that system was a good one; I think there was a necessity for something to be done in order to relieve the pressure of distress.

3491. Are you of opinion that the poor law administration was not able to deal with these cases?
Yes; certainly.

3492. Why?
Because the Poor Law does not contemplate a remedy for the disease; it only contemplates a punishment for the crime.

3493. I was not, at present, asking you with regard to the subsequent steps which you took, but I was asking you with regard to the tickets which were issued for lodgings, and, I suppose, some food, to these persons; and I want to know why (I daresay there may be reasons) there was any necessity for them, and why these persons could not have been relieved by the boards of guardians in the regular way?
The boards of guardians, practically, adopted the same system; the pressure was so great, in the centre of London, in the Strand Union, that the board of guardians issued tickets themselves on lodging-houses, the casual wards being full.

3494. Was there any advantage in supplementing that action of the guardians by these private tickets?
It would not be supplemented by private tickets; the private tickets stopped before the guardians began, but I am not quite sure about that.

3495. But is it not clearly the duty of the guardians of the poor to afford food and shelter to all persons who may apply to them who are in a destitute condition?
No doubt it is.

3496. Then, are you of opinion that the guardians failed in their duty?
No, it is difficult to say that, because the duty does not come before them until the man applies, and the best men, as a rule, will not apply, unless they are forced by absolute destitution, for such relief and such shelter as the guardians alone give them.

3497. But is it desirable that they should be afforded any other shelter than that which the guardians give them; we are not on the question of work; I am speaking of shelter now?
Yes, I think it is.

3498. Why?
I think that there is a class for which the shelter which the guardians provide is not sufficient; is not of the kind required.

3499. Then, are you of opinion that there ought to be a system for affording to persons who are above the class of the absolutely destitute, relief at the expense of other people?
Yes.

3500. By the Poor Law or by private persons?
I do not care whether by the Poor Law or by private persons.

3501. Which by?
I have no opinion on the subject.

3502. It is very material to the whole matter. Having taken part in the administration of this relief, have you formed no opinion whatever as to whether the Poor Law is sufficient, or is not sufficient, for the purpose, and requires its function to be extended?
You are asking me whether it is my opinion that the relief which I think ought to be given should be given by the Poor Law; as a matter of fact, it is not given by the Poor Law, and, therefore, must be given outside.
11th June 1888.

Rev. J. Kitto.

3503. Do you think it ought to be given by the Poor Law?
I think it should be given.

3504. Then your opinion comes to this, that the system of administration of the Poor Law in London was not such as to enable the guardians to provide for these persons?
Quite so.

3505. Is that consistent with what you just now said, that when the casual wards were full they gave them tickets for lodging-houses?
Yes, I think it is quite consistent, because the ordinary system of the guardians was enlarged to meet the particular strain. Under the ordinary system, the guardians do not give these tickets, and I do not know that they could be expected to give them; but the system of the Poor Law does not contemplate in the casual ward the class for which provision had, somehow or other, last winter, to be made.

3506. What class do you mean?
The class of decent unemployed.

3507. On what ground do you say that the Poor Law does not contemplate that class?
Because it is penal.

3508. Might I ask what you meant by saying that the poor-law system is penal?
I did not say the poor-law system; I said that portion of it; I am speaking now entirely of the casual ward.

3509. Why do you say that portion is penal?
A man who goes into the casual ward is imprisoned; he is put to solitary confinement; he is given, I do not know whether it is work which is drudgery, but certainly it is not work which anyone would take; it is work which is universally disliked, and taken to be a badge of the workhouse, the stone-breaking; and from the time that he goes in until the time he goes out he is practically in prison.

3510. As I suppose, may be said of anyone who is in the workhouse?
It may be; but the conditions are not exactly the same.

3511. Would it not be more correct to say that the relief that is given to him is given to him in a manner which must be very disagreeable to him?
Repulsive, quite so. But there is a further point, much more important to my own mind; that is, that there is no effort put forth by anybody on his behalf to rescue him from the condition into which he has fallen; that seems to me where the poor-law system is the weakest.

3512. But, confining myself at present to the casual ward, are you of opinion that it would be right that, at the expense of the public, some more agreeable relief should be afforded to persons who require casual relief?
Yes, so long as there is a discrimination exercised in the administration of relief; there is none now.

3513. What discrimination?
As to the character and condition of the persons to whom it is given.

3514. Do you mean that you would have different classes connected with the workhouse, and in some there should be a penal treatment, and in others there should be a treatment of a more generous kind?
Quite so; it is so now in other departments.

3515. Will you explain that answer?
I mean to say that the sick, for instance, are not treated in the workhouse; there is a separate infirmary for them.

3516. Those in the infirmary must be treated, of course, differently from those who are sound in health; but is there any different treatment of persons of bad character in the workhouse from those of good character?
I suppose,
35.17. Do you think it would be possible to pursue another system with regard to those about whom much less is known, those who apply casually?
I do think it is possible, because that has been tried, and tried with success.

35.18. How would it be possible, in the case of a man applying for a night’s lodging, to find out what character he had, so as to be able to give him a lodging of a different kind, according to whether he was of bad or good character?
I do not think it could be possible for a man applying for one night’s lodging.

35.19. And if he applied for more than a casual lodging he would go into the workhouse?
He might.

35.20. He must; after a certain period he would cease to be in the casual ward?
Yes.

35.21. I am confining myself to casual paupers; am I to conclude that you consider that the mode of treatment of casual paupers is in many cases too harsh?
Yes.

35.22. And that it would be desirable to relax it, so that those who wish for a night or two’s lodging should obtain it upon more agreeable terms?
I should not put it in that way.

35.23. Put it in your own way?
I should say that the present system, the casual-ward system, is not too harsh, except for those who have, without fault of their own, fallen into that condition, and that the guardians might be able to exercise (or somebody acting with the guardians, it does not matter to me which) a power of discrimination and selection, and that the people who get into the casual ward might be, by judicious treatment, helped out of the casual ward, many of them, and be set on their feet again.

35.24. You would not be afraid that if this more pleasant lodging, or hotel (as I believe that class of persons frequently call it), were provided, we should have a very large increase of that kind of applicants?
At first, no doubt, we should have, but if the question were carefully dealt with, and the applications were found to lead to no practical results, except in the case of those who were deserving, that increase would not be continued.

35.25. You mention “those who are deserving;” did your experience of this class show that there were many of what you would term the deserving class applying for this casual relief?
In the course of, I think it was four weeks (I am not certain to a day or so), during which period we dealt with three casual wards, we made a rough selection.

35.26. Just mention which they were?
They were Marylebone, St. Giles’, and St. George’s. We made a rough selection of about, I should say, 200 people who we thought were apparently sufficiently deserving, sufficiently above the ordinary professional casual class, to be further helped; and we made inquiries about them. A good many of them, of course, never turned up again to answer the inquiries. They were all told ultimately to go to the nearest office of the Charity Organisation Society; and by means of the Charity Organisation Society we made very careful inquiries into the cases of most of them; into those of all of them, in fact, all those who presented themselves. The result was that, out of those we selected in the four weeks, we resolved to start 45 out of about 200. Those men were, some of them, sent back to friends; some were sent to work, which we found for them;
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and some were kept at work by us for about three months. We kept some
of the men at work in order partly to test them, to see whether they would
stand a somewhat severe test, because they were paid small wages, and had to
do hard work; and, what is far worse to an ordinary London labourer, as he
calls himself, they had to do work which was regular, and they were told
distinctly that if they were not regular in their work they would be dis-
charged. The result was that those men under the process were improved
in physique, and improved in appearance, so that at the end of three months we
were able, with a clear conscience, to send a good many of them away to the
colonies.

3527. Of those 200 do you think that many, or any, would have accepted
an order for the house?
I cannot tell you that.

3528. You have formed no idea as to that?
I cannot form any idea at all; we did not ask the question.

3529. When you speak of deserving poor, you probably have in your mind
some general definition of "deserving;" from that point of view, how would
you define a deserving person?
I do not think you can define it; you must take each case by itself, and
consider.

3530. You must have some notion as to what sort of a man is deserving.
Would you term a man deserving who had large wages all last summer, and
excellent health, and had no one to support but himself, and in the winter
applied for relief?
No, I should not.

3531. Suppose he was a man who, in any case, had had high wages, a painter
or bricklayer or carpenter, and that he applied for relief in the winter; do you
think he is a deserving man?
It depends entirely upon the circumstances. I cannot consider deserving
simply with regard to wages.

3532. But under any circumstances, would a man, from that point of view of
being deserving of relief, deserve any special consideration?
He might.

3533. On what ground?
Because he had been ill, or his family had been ill, and he was unable to
support them.

3534. Of course, if a man has been unable to earn high wages the question
does not apply; but I ask with regard to a man who has earned good wages
during the summer and sufficient to have saved a portion for the winter; I wish
to ask whether you think a man who under these circumstances has applied for
relief in the winter is deserving of consideration?
No, certainly not.

3535. Are there many who would come under your notion of deserving?
An immense number, because they cannot get employment. Your Lordship
must be fully aware that the condition of the labour market for some time past
has been such that the whole country contributes a surplus population to London,
and Londoners are driven out of employment, and very often the country people
themselves cannot get it.

3536. And do you think in the summer there is a large class of people who
do not get employment?
I am certain there is.

3537. How is that consistent with the not very large amount of pauperism
there is in London?
I think that the amount of pauperism is not really an index, or only a very
rough index, of the number of persons out of employment or only in partial
employment. Your Lordship was speaking of the case of a man who had regular
wages
wages and high wages during the summer, and did not provide for the winter. I am speaking of a class of men, which is very numerous, who get very casual employment, and perhaps in the winter no employment at all.

3538. Assuming that, which no doubt is the fact, there is and always will be a class of men of that kind, is it not certain that the easier you make it for those men to obtain relief in the winter, the less will be the wages they will take in the summer, and the poorer and more miserable will be their position?

I do not know.

3539. Can you give any reason why it should not be so?
That is a question of political economy which I do not feel that I am here to give evidence upon.

3540. The whole question, I take it, is a question of political economy, and I want to know whether you see any reason why cause and effect should not operate in the way I have indicated?

I did not come to give evidence on questions of political economy.

3541. Still I understand that you so far enter on the field of political economy that you have practised an important part of it, the actual giving of relief under certain circumstances, which is a portion of economy; I ask whether, if you make relief easy in the winter, that does not tend to make wages low in the summer?

If relief were made too easy, no doubt it would have that effect, but under conditions under which the relief is made less easy than work I do not see how the one can interfere with the other.

3542. I think the other point you more particularly wished to bring before us is, dealing in some way with this class of casual paupers so as to put them in the way of getting employment?

Yes; with these casual paupers we did that, having first of all tested them and found that they were really men who would work; and I want to point out that, according to the present system, the guardians do not do that, and I do not know whether they can do it or not. But at any rate what we did was to keep these men at work for three months; by an arrangement with Lord Meath we sent them to the regular work of digging at the Tower Gardens then being made, and in that way we tested them regularly; and their condition was improved, and if your Lordship would look at the first of the letters on this paper which I have handed in to your Lordship, you will find the way in which a man who has been sent out (this man was sent out to Canada, I think) speaks of the altered circumstances in which he is placed now; so that it has been in that case triumphantly successful.

3543. Perhaps we might take the case of emigration presently. I should like to ask you, with regard to the men employed on this work, what wages they earned; whether they earned the wages of ordinary labourers for such work as they did?

No; they were not allowed to earn, I think it was, more than 11 s. or 12 s. a week, and ultimately they were paid, I think, 16 s. a week, but still below the current rate of wages.

3544. Has it not occurred to you that that is a direct interference with the labour market, prejudicial to the honest and respectable labourer?

No; it does not occur to me in this way. The work which was being done was work which would not have come into the ordinary labour market at all.

3545. Then what reason was there for doing it?

It is a recognised charitable work to lay out gardens.

3546. In point of fact, what you mean in this: that this work was, in fact, a charity given in the form of work?

Yes, that is it. I mean to say that it did not throw out anybody who was at work.

3547. It would not have been done unless for charitable reasons?

That is so. I do not say that it would not have been done, except to employ (70.)
these particular men; it might have been done. I do not know; but, as a matter of fact, the public had not contributed the money up to that time.

3548. Supposing this system was a good one, and that every winter charitable persons were to find work of this kind at low wages, would not the result be that people would come every winter to London for the express purpose of getting such work?

I am afraid it would. They come to London quite fast enough; I do not know whether any more could or would come; I think the country districts are pretty well deple ted.

3549. Have you any evidence which you could refer us to within your personal knowledge to show that the country districts are depleted, or that there has been an extraordinary influx of agricultural labourers into London during the last two years?

I do not know during the last two years, but the fact that the increase of the population from the country districts flows to the towns is, I suppose, beyond dispute.

3550. Undoubtedly the increase of the population goes to the towns:
And universally, I suppose, agricultural districts are diminishing in population.

3551. We need not go into that; some are diminishing, some are stationary; have you in any case come across any agricultural labourers applying for relief?

You mean in this particular way at this particular time.

3552. Yes?

I have come across men who have been employed in the country, coming to London and failing to find work; that is one of the most common forms that beset us in our parochial experience.

3553. Then I suppose they are generally removed back again to the districts to which they belong?

That is extremely difficult to do; it can only be done when they apply to the Poor Law for relief.

3554. But if they do not apply to the Poor Law for relief they do not come upon the rates?

No, they do not come upon the rates, but they do come upon individuals.

3555. Perhaps you will be of opinion, with some other witnesses before us, that the effect of the influx into London of agricultural labourers is rather shown in the displacement from work of a certain number of the existing population than in any other way?

Yes, if I understand your question rightly.

3556. To put it in another way, that the influx of agricultural labourers is not to be gathered from agricultural labourers applying for relief, but the consequences are to be seen in the application for relief of those whose labour has been displaced by them?

Yes, the ordinary London population; that is to say, that pretty nearly every employer in London prefers to take a person from the country rather than a Londoner born. I think you would find that the police, for instance, and the class of railway porters, people of that sort, are very largely recruited from the country districts; and so it is with the servants at hotels and clubs.

3557. What became of these men that you employed upon these gardens, as far as you were able to trace them, after the work in the gardens ceased?

By the time that the work in the gardens ceased we had arranged for them. Some were sent to sea; some were sent to places in other towns, where we had obtained work for them; and some were emigrated.

3558. Now, the general drift of your evidence, I think, would be this, that it is very desirable that the action of the Poor Law should be supplemented by charitable organisations?

Quite
Quite so; that is the very point; that, for instance, in this particular case, as in many other cases, with regard to the casuals with whom I have had to do lately, the Charity Organisation Society, or some similar body like that, are called in to investigate and take note of the cases, just in the same way as the Metropolitan Society for Befriending Young Servants takes note of the girls who go out from the district schools and provides for them; that is a combination between charity and the Poor Law, which is greatly to the advantage of both.

3559. You suggest that there should be some means of investigating cases, to sift out of them persons who do not belong to the vagrant class, but are, in the legitimate use of the word, casually out of employment, and that those cases might be afterwards dealt with?

Yes; there is a regular casual class, which is as distinct as any other profession, I believe.

3560. You would have no objection to the most strict dealing with the casual class, generally so called; but you would like to separate the others from them?

Yes, quite so. I wish the Poor Law would not help the professional casual at all.

3561. Are there any points I may have omitted, which you would like to add?

I can only endorse the evidence you have had given already by Mr. Strachan, of the Chelsea district. We tried very much the same thing in the district of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. I am not going to defend it on economical grounds, but the vestry felt that there was a certain amount of work which might be done, and that it would be, at any rate, some small relief to the persons who were unemployed to do it at that particular moment; and accordingly we paved a certain number of streets during the early months of this year. We employed on this only a small number of men; we paid them, on an average, about 5l. an hour; but the result is that the surveyor says that, though the men were not equal to ordinary contractors' men, and could not do the same amount of work at first, yet they did their work very well; and the work, he believes, is as good work as any that could be done by contractors, and that the experiment was highly successful.

3561*. Are you able to say, as Mr. Strachan said, that the financial result is as satisfactory as it might have been if you had employed contractors?

I cannot go so far as to say that, because it so happens that this particular work was done at a time when there were no other contracts running with which to compare it. The surveyor tells me that the labour cost distinctly less than it would have done under an ordinary contract; but he thinks the material cost more, the reason being that since the last contract the vestry made the materials had advanced in price; but of course that might have nothing to do with it, and may be thrown out of consideration altogether.

3562. So that, on the whole, the financial result was what?

On the whole, the work cost, I think he said, about 20 per cent. more than the last contract work that the vestry had done; but then that last contract work was done at a time when the weather was better and our materials cheaper, so that you cannot compare the two.

3563. You are not able to say whether any portion of the expenditure may be set down to charity, or whether it was all fairly on commercial grounds defensible?

I am not able to say that; but my feeling is that it was commercially defensible.

3564. Earl of Aberdeen.] Can you tell us for how many years you have been a London clergyman in active work?

For 26 years.
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3565. In
3565. In connection with which parts of London?
I was for 20 years in the East-end; first of all, five years as a curate in the middle of London, and then 20 years in the East-end of London, and I have been now two years back in what may be called the centre of London.

3566. And you have come to give evidence in answer to a request on the part of the Committee?
Yes. I did not know at all what line the Committee were going to take, or what evidence they wanted from me, or I would have prepared myself.

3567. Have you been officially connected with the poor law administration?
Yes. I was guardian of the poor in Poplar for some years; that was at the time of the very extraordinary pressure in the East-end of London some 20 years ago; a time which nobody who passed through it will ever forget; and I felt that I gained a great deal of knowledge of the Poor Law then.

3568. You mentioned, I think, that the record of the amount of pauperism given by statistics is not, in your opinion, a reliable test of the actual amount of destitution?
Yes.

3569. Would you explain that a little further?
I would explain it in this way: that the amount of pauperism depends upon the way in which the Poor Law is administered; and if there is any tightening of the poor law system, as, for instance, if in any parish the out-door relief is suddenly cut off, there will be an apparent diminution in the amount of pauperism; it may not really affect the actual want of the parish in the least. Again, if at the same time, in two contiguous parishes, one has out-door relief, and the other has none, there will be obviously a larger number of persons on the rates in the one than in the other in proportion.

3570. Then do we understand from you that in your experience there are frequently a vast number of people in actual destitution, who, nevertheless, do not apply for relief to the poor rates?
Yes, I am certain of that.

3571. Is it from unwillingness to go into the house that they do not apply to the rates?
Yes, from unwillingness to go into the house. I do not think anybody who has not lived among the poor can know the absolute dread of it there is amongst a certain class, and perhaps the best class of the people; they will struggle to the last to keep out of it.

3572. Chairman.] You think that very wholesome, do you not?
I do.

3573. Earl of Aberdeen.] While you recognise the healthy element in that feeling, do you think it reasonable to aspire to some alleviation of that state of things; I mean the acute destitution often existing without relief from the rates being applied for?
I think that if out-door relief is given it should be adequate for the poor.

3574. You do not object to out-door relief on principle?
No, not at all, and especially in the case of a certain number of old people.

3575. Do you think that a greater amount of discrimination and classification in the administration would tend to meet the difficulty?
Of course that is the real difficulty; in every form of relief the difficulty is to discriminate, and one quite feels that the power of the guardians to discriminate, really to distinguish those who ought to be relieved from those who ought not to be relieved, is to a certain extent in London paralysed by the number of persons with whom they have to deal. In a small country village probably every man is tolerably well known, and the guardians of that particular parish know whether the applicant is a person who should be aided by the Poor Law or not; but it is extremely difficult in London to exercise that discrimination; still I think some effort should be made to exercise it.

3576. Are
3576. Are you aware that in some districts of London, where out-door relief is administered with apparently but little discrimination, the percentage per thousand of pauperism bears a more favourable appearance than in some other districts where out-door relief is practically abolished?

I did not know that; but I should be quite prepared to find that, because the differences between the circumstances of the districts are so great. For instance, what affects the poor in St. George's-in-the-East is extremely different from what affects the poor here in the centre of London.

3577. With regard to the difficulty of getting persons from the country sent back to their own districts, except through the Poor Law; have you had much to do with that?

Not a very great deal, only in individual cases as a parish clergymen. The persons, for instance, have come and settled in my parish; they have only been there a short time, and have come from the country. Of course the first question I ask is, “Why do you come, and will you go back?” But when a man has left, whatever be the reason, there is generally a very great reluctance on his part to go back again. I suppose in many cases he came to London with the idea amongst his friends that he was going to make his fortune there, and he does not like to go back and own that he has not succeeded.

3578. In such cases are not we confronted with the difficulty, that whilst all are agreed that it is desirable to keep the men off the rates if possible, on the other hand there is no available means apparent for getting them back to the country unless the man is on the poor rates?

No; and I should think the number of persons who are transferred to the country by means of the Poor Law must be a very small portion of those who are really in the position described.

3579. You think such cases ought to be dealt with by private charity?

Yes; I think there is a sphere beyond which the Poor Law cannot reasonably go, especially in London. My own feeling is that something might possibly be done in this way. I do not know whether the out-of-work people in country places could be more kept at work by country unions than they are, and so prevented from coming to London.

3580. In your experience, and as a matter of general experience, is not the receipt of doles from charitable sources equally deleterious with the receipt of relief from the rates?

No.

3581. Why not?

I think that any relief given officially, whether it is given by the Poor Law Board, or whether it is given by a committee, is deprived of that which is the chief virtue in a gift; and that is the personal sympathy on the one hand, and the gratitude on the other. Those feelings are entirely eliminated from anything like official relief, and it must therefore do a greater amount of harm than what is given privately. We all act upon that principle in our own private life.

3582. The expectation of more is a very common tendency, whether the relief is from private charity or the poor rates?

Yes, quite so; I am afraid that is a natural human infirmity that nothing will ever correct. I should like just to suggest that it might be possible to form some alliance between a London union and a country union for the treatment of the able-bodied poor, whether casuals or not. The difficulty that everybody has in London in dealing with applications for relief is the difficulty of testing. My own feeling is that you cannot test a man in any way except by offering him work; and if the conditions of the labour market are such that you cannot get work to offer him, then you have no means of testing whether that man's case is genuine or not; you are absolutely helpless. In London the amount of work that can be provided, either by charitable relief or the Poor Law, is distinctly limited; we have not room to do anything; but it seems to me that if we could devise some plan by which persons who were able-bodied, and who (70.)
need not be tested, could be tested away from London, it would be a great help to us in dealing with such cases; what I felt more than anything else is that we want to test the thing.

3583. Chairman.] But why do you think that more labour can be obtained in the country?

I mean that you can invent labour in the country; there is more room; you can set a man to gardening work.

3584. You mean that you can make a man dig a hole and fill it up again?

No; you may make him grow cabbages.

3585. But will anyone set him in the country to grow cabbages unless there is a profit to be obtained by it?

I think the guardians instead of setting him to break stones might set him to grow cabbages.

3586. Do you think that on the whole it would be satisfactory to a rural union, where perhaps there is not enough work for the labourers of the union to do, that if a man in London applies for relief he should be sent down to that union to do some work that otherwise they would do?

No, I was not saying that.

3587. If labour was required; no doubt the country labourers would be glad to furnish it?

The guardians set men to break stones, that nobody wants particularly.

3588. That is the reason, because it does not interfere with other labour; the cabbages might be grown by somebody else?

The man himself might eat the cabbages. I mean to say simply this: that I did not mean that the country unions should necessarily pay the wages to the man; but that we are tied here in London practically to doing without a test; we cannot test.

3589. Why should you not have a labour-test house, as they have in Birmingham, to which all able-bodied men are sent, and where labour of various kinds is performed within the walls of the house?

We have not got that, but it would be very useful if we had. It seems to me that the whole position is governed by that consideration, the difficulty of a test.

3590. Earl of Aberdeen.] You suggest that some system of that sort might be carried out with greater facilities perhaps in the country?

I thought so, even if we had a house.

3591. There would be greater scope for experiments, at any rate, in the country?

For instance, I am conscious of the fact that, when I was a guardian of the Poplar Union, we were the farmers of the able-bodied of adjacent unions; we took in the able-bodied of adjacent unions, and other unions took in our sick and infirm.

3592. Chairman.] How was that; because the able-bodied of other unions would not have any claim upon Poplar?

But they paid so much a head for them.

3593. By contract, you mean?

Yes, that is the kind of thing in my mind; that a country union, or a suburban union, might have an able-bodied house and contract for the able-bodied Londoners.

3594. Earl of Aberdeen.] There are places, are there not, in the country where, without interfering with the labour market, something could be done in the way, for instance, of an experiment with waste land, which the board of guardians might set men to work on, and which would not cause discontent, because others in the district have not made any movement in that direction? I cannot help thinking that it would be possible to do that.

3595. Had
3595. Had you in your view something similar to the agricultural farm which has been suggested in the country?
I know what the agricultural farm is, but I would not confine it to the founding of an agricultural farm and going on in one particular groove, I would like what your Lordship has suggested, only I do not know why such a laboratory should necessarily be in London where it is so difficult to work it.

3596. Chairman.] If you had houses connected with the Poor Law administration in London where a labour-test could be properly applied, might not that to a great extent meet your wish?
Yes, it would to a very large extent, if that test could be applied not only to the professional pauper, the professional casual, but to a man who is out of work for the time.

3597. And probably, as a rule, the kind of labour which could be required in such a house as that would be more suitable for a town population than labour in the country?
Probably it would; obviously the labour must be such as everybody can do, and that is one of the difficulties at the present time.

3598. A large number of persons in a town population would not be adapted to agricultural labour?
No, they would not, but they do learn it very soon all the same.

3599. Earl of Aberdeen.] I presume your idea would be, that in the country all the labour which could be done in a town test-house could be done, and some other sorts of labour, in addition, which are not accessible in a town test-house?
Yes, and it could be more cheaply done; I mean that the land is cheaper in the country.

3600. And buildings?
Buildings are cheaper.

3601. Earl of Strafford.] On the question of casual wards, did you hear last winter and the winter before of an amateur casual ward or temporary home, that was formed by Mr. Harold Bolton, in the Commercial-road?
Yes.

3602. Did it work pretty well?
I am not sufficiently familiar with the details of its working to be able to say.

3603. I am told that there was shelter afforded, firing, bread, and water, and that they were allowed to go out earlier than they would from the casual wards of the workhouse?
I believe that is so.

3604. And I am told that a very large number had relief every night under this system, and were very well conducted, and that the advantage was, that they were able to get out earlier in quest of work; and Mr. Bolton told me that he thought it had worked well, and that if we extended it to the official casual wards it would be an advantage to that class of people?
I think it has been extended to the official casual wards, so far as the going out early in the morning in search of work is concerned. I think Mr. Ritchie issued a circular early in this year which modified the practice of the board of guardians in that respect.

3605. You have not heard anything unfavourable with regard to that home?
No; I should think that one distinct element in that home is that the managers of it do seek to help the men to get work if they are deserving of help, which is a distinct advantage over any kind of casual ward.

3606. Do you think it would be possible to extend to other parts of the metropolis that system of amateur casual homes, if I may use the term?
There are a certain number, I might almost say a sufficient number, if they were all properly administered.

(70.)
3607. Are you acquainted at all with the working of that system in Paris; I am told it is carried out there?
   No, I am not acquainted with it.

3608. Lord Thring.] The result of your evidence is this, is it not, that Charity and the Poor Law must work together for the proper relief of the poor, but that their places are separate; charity is for the deserving poor; the other, poor-law relief, is for the destitute poor?
   Yes; but it is the province of some one to find out which is which; and that seems to be the province of no one in particular under the present system.

3609. But if that be found out, then you approve of combination between the two?
   Yes; but the whole point is that poor-law relief is indiscriminate relief, and that indiscriminate relief is bad.

3610. Lord Sandhurst.] Do you find the Charity Organization Society of great assistance?
   Very great indeed; this particular work which I have been describing could not have been done without the Charity Organization Society, and I look forward to undertaking it on a larger scale. I do not know whether that would be possible; it is a very arduous and difficult work to do.

3611. Earl Spencer.] When you spoke of country unions helping London unions in the way of finding work, did you mean that the destitute poor should be lodged in the union workhouse in the country?
   I had not formed a definite scheme or plan; it was more in the way of a suggestion; but that was what I meant, that the poor should be lodged in a country house, and work in a country house, and that what could be ascertained with regard to them could be more easily ascertained there than where we have to deal with such large numbers.

3612. Then you would not send them to their own district workhouse?
   I would send them to the union, whatever it is, which was, if I may say so, married to the London union.

3613. But, if I understand you rightly, you intended it to be work in a district union house; not work outside the union house; I only want to get your evidence clear on the point?
   Yes; I do not mean necessarily within the walls of the union, but just as convict work, for instance, is done outside the prison.

3614. Do you mean what I have heard of in country districts, the clergyman having a field that had been ploughed up in order that the men in the village might get that work?
   Not necessarily that, though that might be a possible way of dealing with it.

3615. Now with regard to these amateur casual wards, if there were a good many of those would it not rather attract those casuals, or whatever name you give these poor, to come to London in greater numbers than they do now?
   It is an extremely difficult question to answer. London presents in itself such enormous attractions for people who do not know it, that I almost doubt whether anything could add to the attractiveness of it in their eyes.

3616. But, I suppose, you would think that very profuse gifts of money in times of distress would attract in that way, and it manifestly does attract, besides the ordinary attractiveness of London?
   Yes, and of course what I have already said with regard to the organisation of casuals or outcasts in Trafalgar-square bears that out; tickets for lodgings were freely given. I think the Chairman was under the impression that I was responsible for the giving of them. I was not that; it was not my invention; I wanted to get rid of them as soon as possible. They were being freely given, and as a consequence persons were being attracted from all parts of London and every lodging-house near was emptied. When it came to throwing shillings and half-crowns over the railings to the crowd underneath, then one quite understands that it was very attractive indeed.

3617. Chairman.]
3617. Chairman.] That was out-door relief in its most attractive form?
   Certainly.

3618. Earl Speaker.] In the same way the increase of these amateur casual
   wards might, might it not, have the effect of attracting more people to London?
   I do not think the amateur casual wards need very much to be increased; we
   came pretty much to a conclusion at the Mansion House Committee last winter
   that there was a sufficient amount of that kind of accommodation, only that the
   accommodation was not used in the best possible way.

3619. A sufficient amount in the workhouse casual wards, do you mean?
   No, they are called refuges, I think, technically.

3620. Earl of Onslow.] I understand your suggestion to be that a London
   workhouse should have a country house affiliated to it, mainly on the ground
   that the land in the country is cheaper and that employment could be provided
   at a cheaper rate than in London?
   Quite so, and under more healthy conditions perhaps, too.

3621. But would not the increased cost of conveying the paupers backwards
   and forwards very much neutralise that?
   It would depend, of course, where it was.

3622. You mean how great the distance was?
   How great the distance. You know a very large number of the London
   unions have establishments now round about London?

3623. But those are, are they not, for a more permanent class, the lunatics
   for instance?
   Yes.

3624. I understood you to say that you considered the treatment of paupers-
   within the workhouse as almost of a penal character, but a little earlier in your
   evidence you said that the administration of poor-law relief was punishment
   for crime; I want to know what the crime is that you hold it to be punish-
   ment for?
   The crime of being poor.

3625. Do you consider poverty a crime?
   No, I do not; but the Poor Law does. I was only speaking of the casual
   wards at the moment, that is to say, that casual wards contemplate distinctly
   the professional casual class, and I do not think they are fit for anybody else.

3626. Do you, then, consider that the Poor Law, as it was framed and as it is
   being carried out, is intended as a punishment and not as a relief, subject to a
   test?
   In the casual ward I think it is, and the tendency has been more and more
   to make it penal. As to the intention by the Legislature, if that is what you
   mean, I do not remember enough what was done at the time the Act was
   passed.

3627. No; I mean, do you think that the intention is that it should be a
   punishment, or that the intention is that it should be a test?
   The intention is that it should be a deterrent, and you can only deter, I suppose,
   by means of punishment.

3628. But I understood you to say that no system could be too rigorous for
   the professional class of casuals?
   If you can find them out, I do not think any system can be too rigorous for
   them.

3629. If you have a more easy system for the deserving class, how are you to
   avoid applying the same to the professional class?
   Only by exercising that kind of discrimination which we all of us have to
   try and exercise in the ordinary affairs of life.

3630. In fact, you say that there should be two classes, and that the guardians
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or the master should have the power of deciding whether a man should be treated as belonging to the one class or to the other class?
Yes.

3631. And you do not think that there would be any difficulty in the way of doing that?
Yes, I do; it is the one difficulty that is always before me day and night.

3632. Earl of Aberdeen. But there are some things which ought to be attempted even though they are difficult?
Yes; my feeling is this, I do not think that we ought to give it up as absolutely insoluble because it is difficult.

3633. Chairman. You have mentioned emigration; you have assisted some men to emigrate?
A large number in my time.

3634. That is to say, a charitable society with which you are connected have assisted some men to emigrate?
Yes.

3635. Do you think it is desirable that men should be assisted to emigrate out of the rates, or that it is better to leave it to a charitable organisation?
I, myself, should like to have them assisted out of the rates, and looking at it from an English point of view; but there is such a strong prejudice against rate-aided emigration on the part of the colonies that I think they would throw very great difficulties in the way of emigration aided by the rates, and that the difficulties are great enough already on the part of the colonies.

3636. Probably, therefore, it would be safer, in your view, to leave those cases to societies, or to individuals, to assist those men who may desire to emigrate?
I do not think the guardians are very anxious to do it; they take up emigration only with great reluctance. At one time (I speak now of 20 years ago) the Poplar Board of Guardians did contribute; they said they would go as far as 500 l. towards emigrating a certain number of persons. That was my first experience in emigration. I never co-operated with a board of guardians in emigration any more.

3637. One of the advantages of a society connected in some way with the Poor Law administration investigating casual cases would be that they might assist to emigrate men who appeared likely to do well?
Yes, it would be a great help.

3638. Would you be rather of opinion that that is probably the best way in which men could be helped?
I think so, provided they are well tested beforehand, so as to show that they are suitable emigrants; it is no use emigrating a man not fitted for it. And of course, in these particular cases, it was not done until I had thoroughly satisfied myself in every possible way that there could be no objection on the colonial side; and I am quite sure that if, for instance, what I am saying now gets into the newspapers at all, there will be a very strong protest on the part of the colonies against such men having been sent to them.

3639. Then you do not think there would be any very strong protest against men being sent that received some assistance to send them if they did not belong to the pauper class?
The casuals, you see, do belong to it.

3640. I only asked the question, if they do not belong to it?
No, if they do not belong to it, I do not think there would, except, perhaps, in one or two places where the labour market is in a peculiar condition.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
Mr. JAMES HARDING, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

3641. Chairman.] I think you have been for 25 years a vestryman of Lambeth, and also of Clerkenwell for three years, and also you have been a guardian of the poor at Bromley Union, in Kent, for some time?

For three years, and also on the Local Board for three years.

3642. Have you had, in London, any experience of Poor Law administration?

I have also been, not on the Charity Organization Society, but the society for dispensing charity for some years, philanthropic lodges, and so forth; I have visited several people in their homes, and I understand a great deal of the way they conduct themselves.

3643. You are not a guardian in London?

No.

3644. I think that you are in favour, to some extent, of out-door relief as compared with in-door relief; perhaps you would give us your reasons?

Yes, I am in favour of it, more especially in the country districts; at Bromley especially.

3645. We are concerned with the populous districts such as London, rather than with the rural districts; from your experience in London, would you be in favour of an extensive system of out-door relief?

Yes, I should.

3646. Would you give us your reasons?

I have been a builder; I have employed a great number of hands in my time; I have had great experience of working-men, and if you could only give the honest, industrious men, temporarily, relief, and not pauperise them, or cause them to pawn all their things, I think it would be a great assistance to them.

3647. You mean that whenever a man is out of work for a time, you think it better to aid him by some out-door relief than to offer him the house?

Should his character deserve it; not if he is on strike or refuses to work for a fair wage, not such a man as that.

3648. Would it be easy for a board of guardians to determine the question of a fair wage?

Very easy, if it had a weekly visitor and paid him 25s. per week, and if a man made an application to them for relief, let him make inquiries. You see the present overseers take very little trouble indeed, and, in fact, I do not think they ever do inquire.

3649. Do you mean that they should make inquiry as to what the rate of wages in the trade was?

No, not exactly that, but whether his character deserves relief, and whether he is out of work of his own fault; that is easily found out.

3650. What would you regard as a man's own fault, from the point of view of poor relief I mean?

There are a great number that will not work at all; their wives go out charring, and they will not work if you offer them a job. I know that if you go to Kennington, you will find daily round a certain public-house there from nine to 15 men, and if you say, "I will give you 4d. for an hour's work," they will not do it; they want 6d. and 7d. per hour; they will not do it for less, and they are constantly there.

3651. To those men, therefore, you would offer the workhouse?

Decidedly.

3652. But if they only ask the wages which are the current rate of wages, would it be easy for the board of guardians to draw the line with regard to men who will not work for something less than the current rate?

(70.)
They might often get employment if they would work for less than the current rate for the class of work offered them.

3653. Would it be possible for the poor law relief to be administered on those terms, that a man should be required to accept work at a lower rate of wages than those that prevail in his trade?

I think it would come into the question of character, and he might not deserve it.

3654. I understand you think that the board would be justified in requiring a man to work at a lower rate of wages than that which prevails in the trade; do you think that would be practicable?

I do, if a man cannot get employment at 9 d. an hour, let him work at 8 d., or if not at 8 d., let him work for 7 d. rather than be idle.

3655. But the result would be that the board of guardians would be an organisation for lowering the standard of wages?

Some men are not worth more.

3656. I suppose that is a matter of opinion altogether. If you once depart from the standard of wages, do you not embark on a very difficult question indeed, which cannot practically be determined at all by a board of guardians?

I have not much to say on that point; my own opinion is that such persons should not be relieved at all who refuse work.

3657. At all events, you would only offer to such persons relief in the workhouse if they applied for relief?

Yes.

3658. They would not come, therefore, within the class to which you would give out-door relief?

No.

3659. Putting aside those men, who would be the men whom you would regard as fit subjects for temporary out-door relief?

I should say the men who have saved a little money; of course they do many of them expend the whole of it, and pawn certain things before they apply for relief; to such characters as those I should give out-door relief according to their family.

3660. I suppose that the men that you have employed probably earned a pretty good wage?

Just so.

3661. What wages would they earn at such work?

I give the labourers 6 d., and the painters 7 d. and 8 d. an hour, and the joiners 9 d., and bricklayers 9 d.

3662. About what would they ordinarily make?

I paid a bricklayer last week 2 l. 5 s.

3663. Supposing that man earned 2 l. 5 s. during the whole of the summer months, and in the winter he applied for relief; do you think he ought to have out-door relief?

Certainly not.

3664. Therefore you confine your recommendation of out-door relief really to those men who, through no fault of their own, are out of employment, and have not had regular employment before out of which they can provide for themselves?

Yes, I should relieve those with out-door relief; and also in the case of persons over 60 years, a man who loses his wife, and whose family has gone away; or where the man dies and the widow is left; if you give them 2 s. 6 d. a week, enough to pay for a room, the family will help them; but if you put them in the house they become perpetual paupers, and cost you 5 s. per week, and the sons and daughters will do nothing for them.

3665. But
3665. But in the case where a man has sons who are in a position to do so, they can be compelled to support him?

They always plead poverty, and they never follow it up; I have been a guardian at Bromley, and I know that.

3666. Did you never bring any son before the magistrate, who had a father whom he should have supported?

Very seldom; and when you do they plead poverty and get off.

3667. Have you ever found, if you offer the house to persons in that position, that their family come forward to support them, if they desert them?

Some give them 6 d., some take a loaf of bread; some of the daughters do the washing and help them to clean their house up, and so forth.

3668. I understand from you that all that you advocate is that where the family are willing to do a portion, as much as they can afford, it is desirable to give something in addition to make up the necessary amount?

I find they always do if you give them a trifle to pay for the room, say 3 s. outside.

3669. Was there any exceptional distress of any kind, a large number of persons out of work, in Lambeth during the time you were a vestryman there?

There is always a large number in Lambeth; that is the home of the mechanics; they come over the bridges and earn their living on this side.

3670. You had a labour yard there, I think?

Yes; where they cut these blocks of wood.

3671. Did the vestry make any special work for the purpose of employing these men at any time?

No, except clearing away the snow and extra sweepers for the roads, and so forth.

3672. Supposing that in Lambeth the system of giving orders for the house had been strictly applied, do you think it would have had a beneficial effect upon the population. Supposing that instead of giving out-door relief the system of only granting relief in the house, as is the case in St. George's-in-the-East, had been applied, do you not think it would have tended to diminish the pauperism of Lambeth?

I do not think it would diminish the pauperism; many would beg or steal, rather than go into the house.

3673. You do not think it would have had the effect of making some of these men, who were not so willing to work as they should be, do something to maintain themselves rather than go into the house?

They would not do it; they would go away and leave their families chargeable.

3674. Do you think that they would become dependent upon thieving?

They would get their living in some way.

3675. But have you ever heard that that has been the case in unions which have pursued that system, that there has been any increase of crime?

I have not gone into that point, but I know that they go into public-houses and get their half-pint of beer with their mates, and there are some who will give them a bit of bread and cheese, and then they will take a few turnips; trifling things, not sufficient for people to take much account of.

3676. Among the men you employed, do you think, in your experience, many of them were members of benefit clubs?

Not so many as should be; a great number are not so provident as they should be; they appear to spend all their money recklessly, many of them.

3677. Is not that a reason for a very strict administration of the Poor Law, in order that there should not prevail the idea that if a man will not save when he could he can get a comfortable home at the expense of the rates?

I should not relieve such persons.
3678. Is there any other point you would like to bring before us?
As regards vagrants and the honest and industrious people who apply for nightly shelter, I should have the vagrants under the police control entirely, and find receiving houses for them there, for the police to deal with and be under their control; separate them from the unions.

3679. Have you many vagrants in Bromley Union?
A good many.

3680. Do you think, amongst them, there are any considerable number of bona fide, if I may so term them, way-faring people; any considerable number of men who are not professional vagrants?
There are many on tramp with their families seeking work that apply there; but I should treat those persons differently, and let them go out at six in the morning to seek work, not keep them there breaking stones, and let them out at 10; they cannot get work at that time of day, especially in market gardens. They come up hop-picking and working in the fruit gardens, and so forth; and if they do not let them out till 10 it is impossible for them to get work.

3681. Probably you think that there should be discretion lodged in the master to allow men who did not belong to the professional class of casuals to go out earlier?
Exactly so.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Luna, 18th June, 1888.
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THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, K.G., IN THE CHAIR.

The Earl Compton, is Examined, as follows:

3682. Chairman. I think you have given a good deal of attention both to the condition of the poor in parts of London, and also to some extent to the system of the Poor Law as administered in London?

I have given more attention to the condition of the poor than to the system of the Poor Law. Of course, in giving attention to the condition of the poor, one finds out a certain amount about the Poor Law.

3683. But your experience of the poor in London has led you to the belief that in some points the administration of the Poor Law is defective and might be improved?

That is my personal opinion.

3684. You will perhaps tell us what are the principal points on which you think that defects exist in the Poor Law?

The question seems to me at the present moment to be a question of whether outdoor relief should be continued as it has been in the past, or whether it should be restricted; whether there shall be an extension or a restriction. As far as I can understand the views of Mr. Crowder and other men who are most fitted to give an opinion upon the case, restriction is, in their view, necessary as regards outdoor relief, in order to minimise pauperism in London. From what I have seen myself, I should say certainly that outdoor relief, although it may have done harm in one direction, has done good in another; but that, of course, is a matter of opinion which can be argued, and I suppose will be argued. I have got Mr. Crowder's pamphlet here, which, I think, he laid before your Lordships, and which I have read very carefully; he was kind enough to send it to me himself; and I should like to point out that I think that where his argument fails (and I take him to be one of the most prominent men at the present moment against outdoor relief), is that he thinks that the rich will come forward to do what the Poor Law, in his opinion, ought not to do. He seems to think that private charity will take the place of the Poor Law. I imagined that the Poor Law existed because it was found that private charity did not do sufficient towards the poor. That may be an odd statement; but, it seems to me that if everybody who had money did their duty towards those who had not, there would be no necessity for a Poor Law system at all, as we understand the Poor Law system. He says, "The relegation of exceptional cases of misfortune from the personal care of the rich to the perfunctory charge of the State is opposed to Christian principles. I am strongly of that opinion too; but, where you find that Christian principles do not carry out what is necessary, (70.)
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you
you have to put something in their place, For instance, in the matter of hospitals, I suppose we should all consider that Christian principles would necessitate our keeping our hospitals in an efficient condition, and yet, when the public are asked to subscribe 50,000 l., which is absolutely necessary this year, they subscribe only half the sum, if as much. I only put that as an illustration. I think that is the point really: what our Poor Law is supposed to do; for what object it is. I think Mr. Crowder imagines that it is only to relieve the extremely destitute; the lame, the halt, and the blind.

3685. In your opinion, is it an incorrect definition of the duty of the Poor Law to say that it is to relieve destitution; meaning by that, to prevent anyone suffering from want of food, or clothing, or necessary shelter, or medical attendance?

I should say that the Poor Law did not carry out what we expect of it, if it did not do its best to prevent destitution as well as to remedy it; that is my personal opinion.

3686. In what way do you think that the Poor Law might operate so as to prevent destitution?

I should say that out-door relief was certainly one of the ways in which it would prevent destitution. It would prevent a man's home being broken up, &c. I see Mr. Crowder has a scheme for that: The head of the family to be tested as a pauper, while his wife and family are supported by, say, the Charity Organization Society. This seems rather a roundabout way for a Government system to be carried on; and after he has been tested, and proved a pauper by his accepting the test, then he would be allowed out-door relief.

3687. I have gathered, from a very interesting article which you have published on "Distress in London," that one of the remedies which you suggest is an extension of the powers to grant out-door relief:

Yes, in the present emergency.

3688. Would you explain a little more fully what that extension of the powers to grant out-door relief, in your opinion, should be. Perhaps I may assist you if I suggest that the power to grant out-door relief is not subject in London, which is not under the Probatory Order, to any very extensive restriction, and, therefore, I am anxious to ascertain exactly what you mean by the extension of powers to grant out-door relief?

The words which I used in my article were: "An extension of the out-door relief system seems to be almost a necessity in face of the present emergency."

3689. I took it from page 153 of your article in the "Fortnightly Review," for January last?

Yes, I do mention there "extension of powers to grant out-door relief."

3690. I wanted to know what extension of powers you wished for; possibly you merely mean the extension of the practice?

For instance, Mr. Ritchie himself issued at the beginning, of last year, as far as my memory serves me, not an order, but a sort of letter, advising the extension of out-door relief; I am only giving it from memory.

3691. Not pressing that point at present. I understand that, putting aside the question of the exact powers which exist for granting out-door relief, you are in favour of more extensively exercising the powers which do exist?

Certainly, in the present emergency.

3692. Would you be of opinion that it should only be when, in the winter, or for any other special reason, there are large numbers of men out of employment, that this out-door relief should be given more extensively, or do you mean generally at all times?

Only in the case of emergency. If you will allow me to add this, my idea is, that there is an emergency existing, or there was in the winter time; that there will be another emergency existing at the beginning of next winter, even a stronger emergency; and that, until something is done in other directions, I should say that
that the extension of out-door relief would be a good thing and not a bad one.

3693. What would you consider to be the best mode of dealing with such emergencies?
For a permanent remedy, do you mean?

3694. You said, until something else was devised; then I asked you what do you consider would be the best mode, or a better mode, of dealing with such emergencies?
As regards dealing with the distress that exists?

3695. Yes?
As far as I can understand, there are two principal ways. One is emigration, and then for another, I am strongly of opinion that we ought to try an experiment in England of such a kind as has been carried out in Holland, of which, of course, your Lordships have had information from Mr Mills and others.

3696. By the establishment, as in Holland, of industrial villages?
Industrial villages, or rather pauper farms.

3697. I observe that you mention in your article two remedies of that kind; "pauper farms as in Holland," and "industrial villages;" do you draw a distinction between the two?
Decidedly. I think myself it would be a good thing if the public boldly faced the present state of distress, and if they did their best to turn industries from the towns into the country. I do not think this should be done by the Government. That is what I should mean by industrial villages; but they would have nothing to do with paupers or the poor in any way; it would be simply that watchmakers, say, the men who work at the very small bits of machinery inside a watch, should be doing their work out of London instead of in London.

3698. But with regard to the establishment of such industrial villages, you would prefer that it should be done by means of charitable assistance?
Certainly.

3699. And not through the instrumentality of the Poor Law?
I think a public company might easily manage it.

3700. But by "pauper farms," you mean farms that would be established under the Poor Law?
Yes, under the Poor Law, or by Government.

3701. Would you explain how you think that should be worked; should the farms be bought at the expense of the rates, or by the Government out of the taxes?
If I were omnipotent, I should prefer the experiment being tried first, not by the Government, because I think that it should first be proved a success before the Government undertake it; but I do not see much chance of persuading the public to try the experiment, and therefore I should like the Government to try it. Of course it would have to be paid for like anything else that is paid for by the Government.

3702. And from what parts of the country would you select paupers; London alone, or every part; and to what extent would the experiment be carried?
For the experiment I should be very much inclined to take a certain number from several poor houses.

3703. Would you take them from the poor houses in populous towns?
Certainly; and I should, at the same time, take some from the country. I should like to prove the difference of the working-power of the two.
3704. Some you would take from the country and some you would take from the towns?
If I were going to try an experiment.

3705. And then you would purchase the farm at the expense of the Government?
Yes.

3706. And place the paupers upon the farm?
Yes.

3707. And what would you consider to be a successful result; what would be the result which you would regard as successful from the establishment of such a farm.

I should consider it a successful result if, by the returns that were received of expenses per head, the country were saved a little money; I should consider that a success.

3708. What you would look forward to would be that the paupers should be maintained at less expense upon these farms than they would have been maintained otherwise by the ordinary method of relief?

Certainly; because in the meantime they would have gained so enormously in the way of having learned to work, and having been removed away from the surroundings in which they would otherwise live.

3709. Then, supposing the result was as successful as you could wish, would you pursue that plan by buying more farms?
Yes, most certainly.

3710. And would you ultimately look forward to having a sufficient number of farms to place upon them the whole of the able-bodied pauper population?
Yes, certainly, so long as it was worked together with emigration.

3711. How would that emigration be worked; who would be selected for emigration?

Those who desired to go. As far as emigration is concerned, it seems to me that the only necessity at the present moment is that men should ascertain really where they can go, and where they would be able to find immediate work.

3712. But would there not be this probably fatal objection to the emigration plan, namely, that there would be no colony which would consent to receive these paupers; we know that the United States would not; and, probably, no British colony would receive them?

But you need not emigrate the present paupers; you might emigrate a good many who are just on the brink.

3713. We were upon the question of the men employed upon these farms; I was not speaking of the general population; and you said that in order to obtain complete success it would be necessary to have emigration in conjunction with the working of the farms?

Yes.

3714. Which, I understand, mean that such as were willing and, in the opinion of the authorities, fit to go, should be assisted to leave the country?

I did not mean the emigration of paupers at the present moment.

3715. Then there would be no emigration in conjunction with the proposed pauper farms?

The reason I said "in conjunction" was because my idea would be that as you took the paupers out of the workhouses, you would be preventing by emigration others coming into the workhouses, or becoming paupers; that is the reason why I used the words "in conjunction."

3716. Then would you establish a general system of emigration at the expense of the State?

Certainly.

3717. Even
3717. Even that, I suppose you are aware, would probably meet with very considerable opposition in most of our colonies.

Very strong opposition, I imagine; but it would depend entirely how it was done. I know how it was done in Ireland when the system was tried there, and I think the reason why it failed was because they sent out from Ireland just the class of men whom the colonists object to receive.

3718. But I suppose you are aware that in many of the colonies it is not only the class of men who are objected to, but any wholesale sending out of men at all?

In some colonies.

3719. In most colonies:

I think we should find that if there were a proper system of emigration adopted, the majority of the colonies would not object to emigration.

3720. Would you contemplate the arrangements necessary for the reception of these emigrants on the other side being made at the expense of the Government here?

Certainly.

3721. Have you any scheme in your mind as to the possibility of recovering that expense to any extent from the emigrants?

I imagine that the return would cover the expense ultimately; a scheme could be devised whereby you could be repaid by the emigrants.

3722. I do not quite understand what is meant by "the return" in your answer?

That the emigrants who were sent out would return the money by degrees; instead of paying their rent there, they would be, as it were, returning their rent, or a certain sum of money per year, to the Government here, in return for the money advanced.

3723. They would be put under the obligation of paying so much per year to the Government at home, you mean?

Exactly, until they had repaid the money advanced.

3724. Do you think such a rent would be easy to collect?

Yes; I do not imagine there would be any difficulty in collecting it.

3725. Now, these farms which you would establish, which would grow agricultural produce, would, of course, compete with the existing farmers and agricultural labourers?

Yes.

3726. Would it not cause a very great jealousy on the part of that class, if farms were conducted at the expense of the State to produce agricultural produce, to compete with that which they themselves produced?

I daresay it might be considered so; but I do not think that it would have that effect, any more than the prisoners being employed in making mats or anything else which is sold outside the prison.

3727. You are aware, no doubt, that there have been great complaints of that?

Yes, I am quite aware of it; but I cannot say that I see much force in the complaint.

3728. Returning to the poor in London, are you in favour of relief works being established to meet temporary distress?

For an emergency, certainly.

3729. And if such relief works were to be established every year, would it not be apt to attract people from the country, for the purpose of getting employment in London?

There could not be a greater mistake than to start relief works in London, and not start relief works outside London. That ought to be done. This was stated at the deputation to Lord Salisbury, and I have always said that it would never do to start relief works in London, unless you have some system (70.)
of relief works outside London, to prevent the coming in of persons from the country into London. But I should like to say that, under all circumstances, I should look upon that as a temporary expedient to meet a very grave emergency.

3730. But you by no means regard that as a satisfactory or permanent remedy or distress?

On the contrary, I should say that it was a decidedly bad remedy, except that we have got now into such a state that I do not see any way of meeting it temporarily except by relief works of some kind carried out in the safest possible manner.

3731. When you say that we have got into such a state, do you mean that you think the distress seriously and widely extended as compared with former periods?

I think it is a very serious danger at the present moment to the country; and I feel (and this, I think, is the point really at which I should differ from some others who have taken a great interest in this subject) that it is not actually those who are called, or who have been hitherto called, the unemployed, from whom the danger would come; when I talk about danger I mean the discontent that is about the country; I believe, that in London there are a large mass of men who are just on the brink of pauperism, just hovering on the brink of it, at the present moment, and that at any given moment, owing to increased distress, owing to something that might happen very easily in any country, they might fall over into the abyss; and I do not think we have sufficient machinery at work to meet that. I think our Poor Law system would break down because of the huge numbers of those who have suffered hitherto and who have not spoken, the honest and industrious, the people who would not go to meetings, who would not clamour in any way, and who are suffering quietly; and I think that if anything is done, it is for those that we should if possible act, or pass laws, or take steps to prevent their ruin.

3732. Do you think that there are more people now than there were, say 20 years ago, hovering on the brink of pauperism?

I should say many, many more; but of course that is an opinion. It is only by visiting people and by seeing people in their homes in London that can be ascertained; and I think that that would be fully borne out by Board School visitors, who are much the best authorities on the subject.

3733. But how do you reconcile the statement that there is more poverty at the present time, with the undoubted fact that pauperism has considerably decreased in the last 20 years?

The number of those who have received relief, you mean?

3734. By "pauperism," I mean all persons receiving relief in any form in England?

As far as I can understand that question it would be against all evidence I have, as regards the increase of pauperism in London.

3735. You may take it as a fact from me, from the Local Government reports, that the statistics of pauperism taken for the last twenty years show a very considerable diminution in pauperism; that is a fact which cannot be denied. Then I ask how you reconcile that with your opinion that there is more poverty?

If that is a fact taking the whole of England, I should say that in London it cannot be the fact, or else we should not get the metropolitan returns that we do.

3736. I said "England," you will observe in my question?

I imagine that a great many of those who, twenty years ago, were paupers in the country, now find their way to the big towns, and particularly London; and I believe myself that pauperism has increased very largely in London, judging by all the returns I have seen.

3737. Supposing
Supposing that we confine ourselves then to London, in which undoubtedly (I am not sure whether it is during the last two or three years; I think two or three at the most), there has been an increase somewhat in pauperism; do you think that an increase which is measured, I think, by the increase from about 87,000 up to 100,000 per week, or something like those figures, in such a population as that of London, and a growing population, represents any considerable increase of poverty; taking into account the large increase yearly of the population of London, do you think that can be said to represent any considerable increase of pauperism?

I know quite well by the statistics that have been published, that wealth is more distributed over the country, and of course that must be admitted as a fact; but I should say, according to the figures that are published weekly in London, there is a gradual increase, a large increase, of pauperism in London, at all events of those who receive relief in London; and that points to the fact that as pauperism is increasing largely, in face of the fact that wealth is more distributed.

We may fully admit that there is some increase of pauperism in London, because the figures show that; but we cannot say that there is an increase of pauperism in the country, because the figures show the direct contrary. Of course my question relates entirely to pauperism, not to poverty.

I quite understand that, the question of relief.

I will put it in this way. I suppose you would not deny that a diminution of pauperism must be considered, at all events to some extent, an indication of the diminution of poverty?

It is so, to some extent.

Lord Balfour of Burley.] Referring to the evidence of Sir Hugh Owen, the Permanent Secretary to the Local Government Board, I put to him this Question at No. 26, "What was the proportion of paupers to each 1,000 of the population in the Metropolis in the last week of January in the present year?" and he said, "25-9." "What was it in 1880? (A.) 26-7. (Q.) And in 1870? (A.) 52-3 per 1,000."

I was quite well aware that the proportion to the thousand has not increased, which is the point of that.

I will give you the gross increase for the last two years. This is at Question No. 20, "Will you give us a statement of the total pauperism of the Metropolis in the last week for which returns are available? (A.) The last return is for the second week of the present month (April). The return gives the total number of paupers, exclusive of lunatics, and vagrants. The total number was 105,829; of these, 59,341 were indoor paupers, and 46,488 outdoor paupers. (Q.) What was the number for the corresponding weeks in the three preceding years? (A.) In 1887, the total number was 98,763; in 1886, it was 97,077; and in 1885, it was 90,010."

The point, as far as I can see, is that at the present moment, although there may be an increase in the number of those receiving relief, in proportion to the increase of population they are less than they were.

The gross increase that can be found is only from 90,000 in 1885, to 105,000 in the present year?

Which, in proportion to the population, is less than it was; is that so?

The proportion to the population which I gave you was for 1870, when it was 52-3 per 1,000, and the present year, when it was 25-9 per 1,000, less than half. The gross increase, you may take it from me, the increase in the total numbers, has only occurred in the last three or four years. Before that time there was a continuous diminution; during the last three years there has been an increase; and the most that can be made of that is from 90,000 in 1882 to 105,000 at the present time.

I should like to ask one question, and that is: Has the increase been rapid in the last three or four years, or has it been about the same each year after 90,000? What is the increase in each of the last few years?
3744. Ninety-seven thousand in 1866, increasing to 98,000 in 1887, and to 105,000 in 1888; and you will bear in mind that the spring of this year was exceptionally prolonged; adverse to people getting work.

But I think it will not be a question of prolongation of spring next year; we shall find that the numbers will go on increasing rapidly. That is the point that I should like to bring before the Committee; that is the point that I wish to bring before the public, if I can; that it is not a question of its being a gradually increasing thing, but of its increasingly enormously each year. I think we shall have a much worse winter in that respect next year than last, and the next one worse again. It will not be a question of a few thousands, as it was when it rose from 98,000 to 105,000, but next year it will be, in all probability, an increase of 10,000 or 15,000, and the next year it will be 14,000, 15,000, 16,000, or 17,000; it will be a gradually increasing number each year. That is where I see the danger.

3745. Chairman.] And it is in order to prevent that danger that you think it should be met by the establishment of industrial villages and pauper farms, and emigration?

Those, I think, are three things that certainly ought to be tried.

3746. Now, your opinion is, as I understand, that the true way of preventing pauperism is for the State to deal with those who are not yet paupers, but, as you termed it, hovering on the verge of pauperism; I think that is your view:

Yes.

3747. Do you think that there ever will be a time in a country such as this when there will not be a very large number of persons who might be described as hovering on the verge of pauperism?

I suppose we shall always have a large number of such persons; but if we have a better system of emigration, there will be other factors to consider. The huge difficulty at the present moment is to know what we are to do with a population that increases much too rapidly. That is another branch of the subject.

3748. Putting aside emigration for a moment, do you think that the State could permanently undertake to provide work for all persons who might be hovering on the verge of pauperism; that is to say, poor, but not so poor that they would apply for relief under the Poor Law?

I think it would be infinitely to the advantage of the State that those who are hovering on the verge of pauperism should not be allowed to become paupers if the State can do anything to prevent it.

3749. I suppose we should all agree that it would be enormously to the advantage of the State and everybody, if the poor could be prevented from being poor; but the question I want to ask is this: whether you think it would be a safe policy for the State to undertake to find work for all those persons who are in the position in which you said a great many now are, and in which you admit a great many always will be?

I am perfectly certain of this, that as long as England lasts, not a single one of those who are even on the brink of pauperism would like to enter into what would be considered a pauper colony, or, as it might be called, a State farm. It would have attached to it such regulations that the life in it would not be so very pleasant, as to attract everybody into it, only those who would prefer doing that to entering what at the present moment we offer them, the poor-house. Mine is an alternative to the poor-house.

3750. And what do you consider would be the advantages of the alternative to the people themselves, or to the State?

I consider that each individual who once finds his way into the poor-house is lost altogether as being a useful member of the State. I imagine that if they were placed in a position where they could work, work honestly, and with good surroundings, they would no longer be useless, and, perhaps, worse than useless members of the State.

3751. What
3751. What would be the difference, as far as being a pauper was concerned between a man who was working on a farm at the expense of the State, and a man who was in a poor-house at the expense of the State; would he not be a pauper in the first case just as much as the second?

A man is a pauper who receives any charity of any kind. A man who receives any charity from the Charity Organization Society, or from his clergyman, becomes, to my mind, at once a pauper.

3752. But is there not a great difference between the receipt of private charity and the receipt of public money in regard to the degradation involved?

Very little in the mind of the person who receives it.

3753. You are aware that a great many people are not of that opinion, but that they think that whereas there is a certain amount of degradation in receiving public money, there is none in receiving private charity?

As regards the recipients, I do not think it is their opinion that there is that difference in the amount of degradation; but it is the opinion of those who give the money.

3754. You consider that the recipients think there is no difference in the position of the man who receives money from the State and the man who receives money from a private individual?

As long as he got it, I do not think the recipient would mind where it came from.

3755. If that be so, would not that rather make the case worse. It is clear that all the recipients of public bounty in State farms would regard themselves as being in the position of paupers?

I think they would to a certain extent; but I do not think it would have the same effect as the workhouse certainly has upon them. I know at the present moment that one utility of the workhouse, and the reason why it is supported so strongly by gentlemen like Mr. Crowder, is that it keeps people away altogether, and saves the rates; that, in fact, although they may be on the verge of starvation, they will go and borrow from their friends, or they will go to their relations and try and get something out of them instead of coming to the guardians.

3756. But is there not also this probable result, that they will make much greater exertions to support themselves by honest labour?

I think there are many thousands who are only too anxious for labour who cannot get it. They have to go somewhere to get means to live.

3757. I suppose if your plan was adopted, one of two things would happen; either there would be persons who would accept relief in that form who would not have accepted it under the present system, or there would not be anyone who would not have accepted it under both systems. Now, if it were the case that there was no one who would accept it under your form who would not have accepted it now, then of course this would not supply a remedy; but supposing there are many who would accept employment from the State in the form in which you would offer it, who would not now accept relief from the rates under the present system, would not the result of your system be largely to extend the pauperisation of the population?

Taking what is understood now by the pauperisation of the population, I do not think it would extend it.

3758. But if there were more persons who received State relief (and you said before that they would regard themselves as paupers) that must necessarily increase the number of paupers?

For the time being, it would, certainly.

3759. And do you think that any gain which you could obtain from your (70.)
system would be a sufficient set-off against the fact that it would tend to increase the number of persons dependent upon public charity?

I think it would be a preferable system to the present one. I do not think it would be a perfect one; but the difficulty would be to devise any manner of dealing perfectly with a large number of paupers, and people who are verging on pauperism.

3760. But if the present system deters a considerable number of persons from applying to public charity, who, notwithstanding, do not starve, is not that a preferable system to one which, by offering more extensive public charity, adds largely to the number of paupers?

I think the gist of that question is that people would be attracted to ask for charity, whereas now they are deterred.

3761. Yes?

I do not think they would be attracted to ask for charity.

3762. But then if they were not attracted, how would it provide for any persons who are not now provided for?

Of course it comes to the question of attracting people who deserve to be helped, or attracting people who do not deserve to be helped. One would have to divide those who are helped into the two classes into which I divide them in my article, the deserving and the undeserving.

3763. Therefore, probably, you would think that there would be a distinct advantage in employing the more deserving poor in the way that you suggest?

Certainly, to prevent them joining the body of the undeserving poor; that would be my idea.

3764. Have you any other point you would like to mention?

No.

3765. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is that the circular from Mr. Ritchie (handing a circular to the Witness) to which you alluded?

This is one of Mr. Ritchie's; but I think there is another.

3766. The date of this circular is "Local Government Board, Whitehall, 11th January 1887," signed by Mr. Ritchie, and sent to the clerk of each vestry and district board; you say that is not the circular?

I was quoting from memory when I spoke about it. I know about this one of Mr. Ritchie's; I was quoting another of Mr. Ritchie's. I still imagine (I may be wrong) that there was some direction to the guardians as regards out-door relief, and I do not think there is anything about that in the circular you have shown me.

3767. There is nothing about out-door relief in this circular?

I think there is, in another circular.

3768. I have communicated with the Local Government Board since the statement was made by you in evidence, and this is the only circular issued by Mr. Ritchie since the early part of last year. Are you thinking of what is known as the Whitechapel Regulation Order, which was to this effect, that the guardians might take the head of a family into the workhouse and give relief to the woman and children, so as to prevent the home being broken up, allowing the man out of the workhouse on one or two specified days in the week to look for work; is that the circular that you were thinking of?

That is the one; it was to the Whitechapel Board, and it was considered at the time, and it was written about in the press, as applying to other parts of London as well as to Whitechapel. That was the one I was referring to.

3769. The effect of that Order was, of course, to endeavour to restrict out-door relief rather than to extend it; in this way, that it gave in-door relief to the able-bodied man, but, if the family were a deserving one, gave the guardians the power of avoiding the breaking up of the home, which is so much dreaded.

Yes.

3770. Have
413. Have you anything to say on the policy of that Order? I think it was excellent.

3771. Did I rightly understand you to say, in the course of your examination, that an extension of out-door relief would prevent destitution? I think in a great many cases it would.

3772. How do you think that would arise? Perhaps I am misunderstanding the question. It seems to me to be on the face of it a fact, that if you give money for out-door relief, the people who receive it will be less destitute than they were before.

3773. Only if the relief is adequate to their necessities? I am afraid that I should say that if they received even half they needed, they would be less destitute than they were.

3774. Is that a policy which you advocate? I think in all questions of relief it has to be very well done, and as far as I am aware the guardians have fulfilled their duties well, as regards giving out-door relief; but at the same time I see that, at the present moment, there are attempts being made by some boards of guardians to cut down the out-door relief, and if that is to be done by one set of guardians, I think, as I stated in my article here, it ought to be done by all, because there ought to be uniformity in the manner in which they act; because if one set of guardians in one district of London cuts down all their out-door relief, it might happen easily that those who do not receive the relief there will go into the district next door (they are all weekly tenants), where, perhaps, they will receive out-door relief from the guardians who are still giving it.

3775. For some years the guardians of Whitechapel, St. George’s, and Stepney have adopted the policy which you have mentioned? Yes.

3776. Are you able to say that that has resulted in the way you are afraid of? I am not able to say that.

3777. If it did so, it could not fail to be noticed, because the unions on whom the extra demand was made would soon take means to remedy it, and call public attention to it, would they not? I should think one would be able to find out easily from the boards of guardians adjacent; they would be able to answer that question.

3778. If the boards of guardians supposed so to be affected have made no such recommendations, it would be fair, would it not, to assume that they have not found the evils arising which you anticipate? Certainly, that would be fair.

3779. Chairman.] But you are aware that if these persons were to remove into another union, until they had obtained settlement by a year’s residence without relief, they would be simply removable back into the place of their settlement, and therefore they would not come upon the rates for any time in another union.

But do you mean that if a man is found starving in London in one union, and he has not been resident there, that he would be sent back to the union where he had been resident?

3780. Certainly? I have not had any experience of the working of that law, and I do not know myself how it could be carried out.

3781. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Have you studied the results of the administration of relief in Whitechapel, for example, in the last 20 years? I saw their returns.

3782. What have you to say upon them; they show a remarkable diminution of pauperism, do they not? If you mean the numbers of the people who have received relief, yes, decidedly;
3783. I think the fact is this, that Mr. Barnett brought the matter before them, and they may have discussed them, but they have not taken any action upon them?
No, they have taken no action; nobody has taken any action.

3784. You, I suppose, admit that the policy which the Whitechapel Board has adopted during the last 20 years has had very remarkable results in the diminution of pauperism in their district?
Certainly, as far as I am able to judge.

3785. It would be fair, would it not, to assume, without pressing it too hard, that, if other boards of guardians had adopted the same policy, they might have reached appreciably near the same results?
I certainly think that the policy adopted by one set of guardians ought to be the policy adopted by all the others; because it is only in that way that one can really arrive at what the result is.

3786. But so long as the boards of guardians are as free as they are at the present time, and acting under somewhat elastic orders, it is not possible to secure a greater amount of uniformity than there is at the present moment, is it. Do you advocate a diminution in the freedom allowed to boards of guardians?
I certainly think it would be better that any plan that was considered a good plan for the working of the Poor Law should be adopted uniformly, instead of only by one or two boards of guardians. I know myself from all that I have heard of the harm that was done by some boards adopting the labour yards. The scale of pay was different, the test was different, and I think it worked harm in London.

3787. Would you be in favour of compelling all boards of guardians to adopt the policy of Whitechapel, St. George's-in-the-East, and Stepney?
Not before I was quite satisfied that that policy was the best.

3788. Would you recommend that these boards should be refused permission to carry out the policy which they have done so well?
Not at all.

3789. Then how are you going to secure the greater amount of uniformity which you aim at?
I should first of all discover what is the best policy; and, speaking only my own personal opinion, I am not quite certain yet that the policy that they have pursued is the best. It has been the best for their own union; but I am not sure that it is the best for the whole of London.

3790. Whom has it injured?
That is just it; that is the question that would have to be decided.

3791. But have you any theory upon the subject of whom it has injured?
I think there can be very little doubt that if people were receiving help no longer received it in one place, they would get it in other ways. I do not imagine that all the people who received out-door relief one year and did not receive it the next, were able at once to become hard-working and self-supporting people.

3792. No one will, I think, contravene that statement. The result at which the Whitechapel Board of Guardians has arrived has been the result of a continuous policy for 20 years?
Yes; in all probability Mr. Barnett has been before your Lordships, has he not?

3793. He has not given evidence. Of course you agree that relief given to paupers
Earl Compton.

paupers should be given under conditions which make their position less eligible than that of those who are receiving no such assistance?

Yes, certainly. By "paupers" you mean anybody who receives relief?

3794. Anybody who receives relief from the rates?

The reason why I asked that question was because, upon the question of relief works (about which I spoke a short time ago), I do not think it would be at all advisable that the people who worked should be paid less money than what they would be able to get in the open market. I do not think that the relief works ought to be done on the cheap method.

3795. But if they were not paid less than in the open market, their position would be considerably more eligible, for they would be assured of employment at the same rate as those who were working under ordinary conditions and were not assured of employment; would not that be the result?

It would be only those who were out of work who would receive the work.

3796. But, still, if the boards of guardians, or the authorities to be set up, were bound to supply work to those who were out of work, at the market rate of wages, then anyone who was out of work would be assured of that employment, and might throw up his situation at any moment, without risk to himself?

I suppose there would be some test. For instance, in all the relief works that have been carried out, it is not everybody who comes and says, "I want to work here," who is given the work; questions are asked, and the case is inquired into, and if he is found to be deserving of work at that moment, he is given it; but everybody is not received who chooses to come.

3797. How would you define an individual whom you would call deserving of work at the moment at which you gave it to him?

First of all, if relief works were started in one district, he would have to be a resident in that district; he must not be a stranger to the district. In all questions of relief I wish to repeat that it is only as a temporary emergency that one would for one moment grant any relief work.

3798. Would you consider an individual deserving who had been employed at 40 s. a week in the summer and had spent it all in what I may call riotous living, without laying by anything for the winter (if his employment was of such a nature that he could only be employed at it in the summer), and then had nothing to live upon in the winter?

That would depend entirely, I suppose, upon the amount he had received during the summer?

3799. I am assuming that he had received 40 s. a week?

For how long?

3800. Say it was in such a trade as house-painting, which can only be carried on in the summer, and which we know to be a precarious one; do you consider that a man engaged in that work, with large wages, who had made no provision at all for the winter, would be a deserving person?

I should prefer giving him work to telling him that he must go to the workhouse.

3801. Would you consider him a person to be so encouraged that he might go back next summer to high wages and feel that he might spend the whole of what he got then without fear of destitution in the winter?

I should prefer running that risk rather than accept the alternative of his going to the workhouse.

3802. Would not the effect of your giving him relief work be to encourage him to go and do likewise next summer?

I think that would be preferable to sending him to the house; if you sent him to the house what would happen to him?

3803. What would the ordinary thrifty man think of being put in a worse position than such a man?

(70.)

I have
I have not advocated that anybody who is short of work in winter should be immediately provided with a very comfortable berth at very good wages; I have never advocated anything of that sort; what I did advocate this last winter was, that where work was necessary, where it had to be done, it should be started then in order that the work should be provided for those who were deserving of it; and as far as I could understand your question, it seemed to me that you were hinting, or that you understood, that my idea was, that anybody who was out of work in the winter should immediately be given very comfortable work which suited him, and which he would be glad to have, at full wages. That was not my contention.

3804. I understood you, certainly, to say that the work which was to be given was to be at the market rate of wages?

Yes, but if a house painter had been receiving 2 l. a week, and, was offered to break up a road in the winter in order to give him employment, as was done in Chelsea, he certainly would not receive 2 l. for that; because that is not what you would pay a man for breaking up a road.

3805. Clearly not; but if a man has received 30 s. or 2 l. in the summer, and another man is only receiving 1 l. a week all the year, surely it is fair to ask that the man who is in a precarious but highly-paid employment for half the year, should make a provision for the other half, and not be put in a better position than the man whose gross takings are the same all the year round?

Certainly.

3806. You would agree with that?

Yes certainly; but how could you force a man who is receiving 40 s. in the summer and nothing in the winter to put by half? If we had such a scheme it would be delightful.

3807. The only way you can do it is by making him as uncomfortable as you can in the winter time?

To carry that out logically, you must say, "If you have no money left you must starve."

3808. No; we can draw the line at starvation?

I would draw it at giving the poor-house instead of starvation. I should like to draw the line by giving something else instead of the poor-house.

3809. Is not the result that every bit you make him more comfortable you put a premium upon the unthrifty as opposed to the thrifty?

I do not imagine that any relief work that would be given to the unemployed, would be more "comfortable" (to use the same word as your Lordship used) than the poor-house.

3810. But if he were assured of relief work at wages it would leave him free to be a great deal more comfortable during the time that he was in receipt of high wages?

In fact you would carry the punishment on to the time when he was hard at work, and trying to get money again for himself.

3811. For the purpose of having a deterrent effect on that individual in the summer, I propose to keep him uncomfortable in the winter; you do not agree?

No, not at all.

3812. What is the evidence on which you rely for saying that there was a very great emergency last winter, and that it is likely to be greater next year?

The evidence that I rely on is my own coming personally in contact with a great many very discontented men who live in the East of London. It is only a matter of opinion; nobody can quite gauge what is going on; but I do not think that anybody could deny the fact that the state of things was very unpleasant last winter in London; and, I should say that the state of unpleasantness would, in all probability, be increased rather than decreased next winter, and again the following winter. It is a matter of opinion.

3813. But
3813. But you have no test of figures which you can refer us to, which would guide us as to the proportion in which the emergency was greater last year than the year before, and is likely to be greater still next year?

I am sorry to say I have none. I am afraid your Lordships will not be able to get any reliable evidence on that, because, unfortunately, there has been no thorough inquiry into the matter in London at all.

3814. In what direction would you suggest that a thorough inquiry should be made?

As regards the distress, do you mean?

3815. Yes?

For nearly two years have I talked and written, and begged for an inquiry of some kind. It would take rather a long time to draw up; but I did in this article which the Chairman seems to have read, draw up a plan for an inquiry; therefore I need not go through that again.

3816. But I do not quite understand, even from that page of suggestions, how the amount of distress which exists can be brought to a test, so as to satisfy impartial people that amongst men there is a greater amount of distress now than at any preceding time?

I think it is a great question whether any form of inquiry would sift the matter to the bottom. I agree with that; but I also think that there might be a form of inquiry instituted through which one would gain very nearly accurate information with regard to metropolitan distress.

3817. What form of inquiry would that be?

That is the form of inquiry that I have drawn up in the article.

3818. To be conducted, as I understand it (I am speaking from memory; perhaps I am wrong), by enumerators asking questions of the people themselves?

Do you mean in the same way as the last inquiry in the poor districts?

3819. That is what seems to be suggested in one part of your page of suggestions?

No. I told Mr. Ritchie before he commenced it that I thought that inquiry would not have the right effect. I thought it was a step in the right direction; but I did not think it was the sort of inquiry to hold. It is a very big question, an inquiry into the distress in London.

3820. You do not think, as I understand from your answers to the Chairman, that if there is this greater amount of distress, it is sure to have made itself known by an increase in pauperism?

I do not think that we are yet aware of the amount of poverty which is in our midst, which is outside what is called pauperism; I do not think we are yet aware of that.

3821. But is it not fair to say that if there are a greater number of people upon the very border line between independence and dependence, a greater number must proportionately cross the line into dependence than did so formerly?

No, I do not think so.

3822. Why not?

Because I think that the people who are at the present moment on the border have been living, and are still living, upon capital, and I suppose the capital is not quite exhausted, but I imagine it is coming to an end; that is my idea, that they have been living upon whatever little money they have been able to put by, and until it is ended, of course we shall hear nothing of them.

3823. How do you suppose that capital was invested or stored up; would not the savings banks returns, or some analogous information give you some idea
idea whether the people that you allude to were living on their former savings or not?

No, I do not think so; I do not see how you could possibly gain information except from the people themselves, and I do not think they would talk about it until they were driven to it.

3824. To go to another question: If you were to extend out-door relief materially, do you think that it would not have the effect of discouraging thrift amongst that section of the working class who are making provision for their old age?

No, I do not think so. I do not think there is a single one of them who would not prefer, if he could, to be independent.

3825. But if such a policy as the Whitechapel Guardians have pursued was pursued over a large area for a considerable time, do you not think that in the nature of things it would be likely to turn the minds of the working classes towards the necessity of making provision for their old age, when they saw that their having done so was regarded as an element in their favour?

I do not know that the policy pursued by the Whitechapel Board has had the effect upon any number of people to increase thrift; that, of course, I am not aware of; I do not think that any policy pursued of that kind would have any appreciable effect upon the people as regards saving money.

3826. You do not think that seeing two men who have been in the same condition all their lives as regards work and wages, one having been careful and the other dissipated, receiving just the same allowance and consideration when they fall, if they do, either from undeserved misfortune or otherwise, into pauperism, would have a deterrent effect upon their fellows, and tend to deter them from making provision for their old age?

No, I do not.

3827. You are aware that many people who have observed the inclination of the working classes hold a different view?

I should think that it would be a matter for discussion decidedly.

3828. Earl of Onslow.] Did I rightly understand you to say, that in your opinion the inquiry which you asked for in this article had not been granted?

Certainly.

3829. I will just take the five points that I see were to be borne in mind during the inquiry. First of all, "The State and Public Bodies as employers of labour:" Are you aware that there are several Committees of the other House of Parliament inquiring into the administration of the Public Departments and their employment of labour?

Yes; since I wrote the article.

3830. As to No. 4, "Foreign Pauper Immigrants," are you aware that there is a Committee of the House of Commons inquiring into that subject?

Yes.

3831. No. 3, "Systematic Overtime Question:" are you aware that there is a Committee of this House conducting an inquiry into what is known as the Sweating System in London?

Yes.

3832. With regard to No. 2, "Removal of Industries from London, and its Causes:" are you aware that several Committees have sat to inquire into the removal of what is the principal one, I believe, the sugar-baking industry, and that an international conference has recently been held on that subject?

Yes.

3833. And then, lastly, "Proportion of Country-bred and London-bred men:" are you aware that both this Committee and other Committees I have referred to, have asked all the witnesses examined before them, questions on that point?

No, I was not aware of that; no doubt that would be part of the subject.

3834. So
3834. So that four out of five of the points you desire to have inquired into are being inquired into, and the inquiries have been commenced, since your article was written?

I think that if the Reports of the Committees with all the evidence, if possible in a condensed form, and what was important in them, were brought out, and if also added to that there were a good deal of information as regards statistics, it would be extremely valuable. I do not know what course is being pursued by Committees, I can only judge by former Commissions and former Committees, whose Reports I have read and whose inquiries I have looked into, but I do not think that all the information as regards distress in London will be obtained by means of Committees that are sitting at the present time. I may be wrong, I hope I shall be wrong; but I do not imagine that we shall get any very reliable information out of the Committees that are sitting as regards the amount of distress in London.

3835. I understand that the form of inquiry you asked for was "A Committee appointed by the Government and containing a large unofficial element"?

Yes.

3836. Do not the Committees of the Houses of Parliament fulfil those conditions?

Yes, certainly; but I did not know that at the present moment any of those Committees were giving their attention to the amount of the distress in London, though of course the Committees all bear upon that; I hope that the information will be forthcoming.

3837. If the Order of Reference specially directs them to do so, your cause of grievance against the Government would be removed, would it not?

I personally am only anxious that the matter should be sifted thoroughly, I do not very much mind by what means. I only suggested it last winter because I did not think that people were paying much attention to the question; and feeling very strongly the urgency of the question, I was tempted to write this article, in order if possible to arouse people to the gravity of the situation.

3838. I asked you whether, in your opinion, the same conditions still exist as when you wrote that "the Government was urged at the beginning of 1887 to grant an exhaustive inquiry, but unfortunately it could not be persuaded to carry out any investigation of a satisfactory character." You said certainly that still held good. I then asked you these questions. Now I should like to ask you whether with that information before you, do you not wish to modify the statement that no inquiry satisfactory to you have been instituted?

I am afraid I shall not be able to give an answer to that question till the result of the inquiry is made public. But I should like to add to that, that I am only just back from the East, having been three months away; and it having been a rather a wild sort of life, I have been out of reach of all newspapers, and all letters and all correspondence. Therefore, I do not know very much what has taken place in England during the last three months. I have only picked up, during the ten days I have been back, here and there by hearing people talk, that these Committees are sitting. Of the existence of these Committees I was unaware, until I returned, at all events, of most of them.

3839. I understood you to say that there was, in your opinion, a very large class who were extremely poor and on the brink of pauperism, but I conclude that so long as they remain out of the workhouse they contribute in some form or another to the rates, and to the support of those who are in the workhouse, do they not?

Yes, certainly.

3840. Then do you think it would be fair to add to their already large burdens that of supporting a very much larger number of paupers, which they would undoubtedly have to do if your proposals were adopted?

(70.)
You imagine that my proposals are to increase the rates largely.

3841. I imagine that they would include a very much larger number of persons than are at present included amongst those receiving relief from the rates. Then I say, do you not think that those who are on the brink of pauperism would strongly object to an increase of the rates to support those who are actually paupers?

I do not think that there would be any very large addition to the rates. Personally I think it would be met if you help people by out-door relief instead of in-door relief. That really would not add anything to the expenses, would it?

3842. Although it may be difficult to ascertain what is the comparative poverty in London at this time as compared with a few years ago, are there any articles, necessaries of life, which have increased in price during the last few years?

No, I should think not; quite the contrary.

3843. Therefore so far as the cost of the articles which the poor have to buy is concerned, they are better off now than they were a few years ago?

Certainly.

3844. I understood you to lay very great stress on the necessity of doing something to prevent the poor from the country coming into the towns; do I understand you to say that that has obtained to any great extent?

My idea is that it has obtained to a very great extent.

3845. Have you anything that you can say to prove that fact, further than a mere belief?

Only by living in the country and in the villages. As a Parliamentary candidate, one finds out a good many things that are going on in the villages; and certainly my experience is that a great number of men are leaving the villages and drifting into the towns.

3846. Yes, but I have confined myself to London?

London particularly. London is really the town that attracts most.

3847. But in London, have you come across any large number of agricultural labourers out of work, seeking work in London?

No, I have not, personally. As far as I have been able to understand from those who know most of the matter, the immigration of the agricultural labourer is rather at the expense of the town-bred man; in fact, that he is stronger, he is a more useful animal, a more useful machine, and he is made use of at once to the detriment, of those who, owing to surroundings, owing to town life, &c., and the places they have lived in for some years, are not so strong, not so capable of performing hard work; I imagine that the agricultural labourers are not the ones who suffer most in London; the ones whose place they take are the ones who suffer most.

3848. I should like to know whether that is within your personal experience; having experience both of the country labourer and the workman in the towns, do you know of men who have gone up from the country to London and got work and ousted London workmen?

No, I do not; I have no particular instances of that.

3849. Chairman. Are you aware at all of the class of persons who were employed upon relief works in the winter in London?

In Chelsea, do you mean?

3850. Yes?

Yes.

3851. There were amongst them, were there not, a great many painters, bricklayers, gentlemen's servants, and watchmakers, and so forth?

Yes.

3852. Do
Do you think the agricultural labourers, who know nothing about painting, or bricklaying, or valeting, or watchmaking, can have displaced men of that kind?

No, I do not.

Earl of Onslow. Now with reference to the statistics which have been quoted of the diminution of pauperism which, until within the last few years, undoubtedly had been the case in London, and which has continued even down to the present time in the country, may not that state of things arise from this cause, that whereas, in London, the out-door relief has been very sparingly administered, in the country districts, the sparing administration of out-door relief has only recently begun to take effect, and that, consequently, we may see a diminution going on in the country while there is no diminution in London?

Yes.

Is the interest you take in this subject derived from your having been a guardian at all?

No, I have not had any experience of that sort; I wish to state that when I was asked to come before this Committee I gave, as an objection to my appearing at all, that I had no practical experience of the administration of the Poor Law, and therefore I thought I should be a very useless sort of witness.

Neither in London nor in the country have you been a guardian?

Neither in London nor in the country.

But your experience is gained from a practical knowledge of parts of London?

I have been from time to time working in the East-end, and seeing people in the East-end, and connected with people working in the East-end.

You are connected with a considerable property in the East-end?

My father has property in the East-end.

You gained your experience both in connection with that property and in other ways in the East-end?

Anything that I do know, I know from coming in contact with and discussing these questions with men who are living there, and have been actively working there for a long time, such as Mr. Billing and others. Then I have worked on a committee with among others four or five of the best of the Trades Unionists, whose opinions I thought extremely valuable.

You have gone among the poor yourself?

I have to a certain extent, sufficient to pick up a little knowledge.

You said that, whenever you have advocated relief works in London, you have always laid great stress on the necessity of having relief works out of London also on any emergency?

Yes.

Would you explain how you would carry that out; where would these relief works take place in the country?

The plan we had in our head when we suggested that to Lord Salisbury was some idea of finding out where there was most distress about the country (for, of course, there is distress in certain parts), and if possible getting centres, and having necessary relief works there, in order to attract to those centres, and not to attract to the Metropolis; because we were aware that at the time of the Mansion House Fund, directly there was the knowledge that there was going to be a fund, a great many people came up to London on purpose to get a little something; and we felt that if there was any question of relief works being started, or if it was talked about and discussed, we should perhaps be doing harm to the Londoner by attracting other people.

But would not you do the same thing in the particular localities where you established these relief works; would you not be doing harm to the poor in the(70.)
the same way there as to the people in London by attracting others to London; you would not be taking merely the people out of work in that district, otherwise the operation of it would be very limited?

But you would only take the people out of work.

3863. The fact of establishing these works would attract people there, just as much as having the relief works in London would attract people to London:

I do not think there is anything like the number, as far as I can understand, of the unemployed out of London that there is in London, and I should imagine that relief works in certain parts of England would have been sufficient to meet the necessity, and would have diverted the stream from coming to the Metropolis; of course how much would have been required I cannot say; I do not know how much distress there is in the country.

3864. You did not propose to send any of the unemployed in London out of London?

Certainly not. One of the ideas was that nobody should receive relief of any kind unless they had been living for a certain time on the spot. It would be only the men who had been resident, say for the sake of argument six months, that would have received any relief work.

3865. You said something about those who advocated the diminution of outdoor relief having the saving of the rates for their principal object; is that quite what you mean; are they not also actuated by a desire really to help the poor?

I think those who, like Mr. Crowder, are against out-relief are genuinely of opinion that it would be of value to the poor that out-relief should not be granted; I think that certainly; and I think there is a great deal to be said for that contention. Mr. Dunn Gardner, who is a member of the Charity Organisation Society, and who is an authority on the matter, has written on the subject, and he, as well as Mr. Crowder, lays great stress on the necessity of individuals giving sympathy and personal help to the poor, and thereby meeting the necessity of the moment; which means to say that the rich are to do their duty to the poor, which hitherto they have neglected. But the real fact is that the rich leave to the Poor Law the duty of helping the poor, because they think the Poor Law system a good one.

3866. We have heard a great deal of the diminution, and I think you have admitted that there has been a great deal of diminution, of pauperism in Whitechapel owing to the system which has been long continued there. Do you know personally whether there is any increase of the sufferings of the poor in that place?

If you asked a gentleman like Mr. George Holland, of Whitechapel, who would give most valuable evidence and who, I think, knows as much about the poor as any man in England, I do not think he would say that this winter there had been more distress than last winter in Whitechapel, but I think he would tell your Lordships there is more distress in Whitechapel now than there was.

3867. You think that the diminution of pauperism is not a correct test of the condition of the poor?

I do not think that it is.

3868. Do you think that the diminution of pauperism under the Poor Law has increased the sufferings of the poor in any way?

I should be sorry to say that.

3869. You spoke of the pauper farms. I presume that if they succeeded you would have to place them in nearly every union; to take the place, in fact, of indoor relief?

Yes; they would take the place of the workhouse eventually, I should hope.

3870. Would not that very seriously affect the ordinary labour of the locality?

I do not think so.

3871. If
3871. If you established one of these farms in a village, would not that displace the ordinary labourers belonging to that village?

I do not see in what way it could.

3872. It would affect the rate of wages there, would it not?

I do not see how; I should not have thought so. That would depend entirely upon the system under which it was done; it might do so if it was badly done.

3873. But you would occupy a farm: that is now being farmed by a tenant, in place of employing the labour of the place, would you not?

The locality to be chosen, of course, would be a difficulty; but I do not think at the present moment there would be very much difficulty in finding an untenanted place, and I do not think there would be much difficulty in finding a place where there was not very much work going on performed by agricultural labourers.

3874. Would there not be some labourers in that district, where there is an untenanted farm, out of work, who otherwise would be employed?

I doubt if it would make any appreciable difference.

3875. With regard to Ireland, you spoke about the bad results of the class of emigrants sent out from Ireland; what class were you speaking of?

I read the report at the time, and, as far as my memory serves me, they were sent from the poor-houses.

3876. You were not speaking of the emigration conducted under Mr. Tuke?

No; that was splendidly conducted.

3877. You were speaking of the emigration that took place some years before that?

I think it was the Government of this country who advanced a certain sum of money, in order to help the emigration of Irishmen to Canada.

3878. In 1882?

Yes.

3879. That was made by Mr. Tuke?

Was it?

3880. I thought you said that you approved of that system?

I knew about him when I was in Ireland; and the system he was working at in the west of Ireland seemed to be an excellent one, and very successful; but in 1882, as far as I remember from the reports that were issued, the condition of the Canadian Government was that paupers were not to be sent; and, as far as I can remember, the one class of people that were sent were paupers, and the Canadian Government objected; but I am sure your Lordship knows more about that than I do.

3881. I wanted to know whether it was this special emigration in 1882 that you objected to, or the emigration that had formerly been conducted under the boards of guardians?

It was only incidentally that I mentioned it. It is almost the only time the Government has advanced money for the purposes of emigration, as far as I know, during the last 10 years, or 15 years.

3882. You have no personal knowledge of that emigration?

None.

3883. It was after you had left Ireland?

Yes, just after.

3884. Lord Thring.] I do not understand your reasoning with respect to the degradation of charity. I understood you to say to the Chairman that you thought a man felt as much degraded by private charity as by State charity, and yet I understood you to say that a man did not feel as much degraded, or would not feel as much degraded, by going to one of your pauper farms as he would by going into the workhouse; I do not understand that?

(70.)
I think what I said was that I did not think the recipient would see any difference in receiving money from the State or from charity.

3885. Why not; as a matter of fact, you say you think he would feel a difference between going into the workhouse and going into a pauper farm; in other words, that he would feel degraded by going into the workhouse, and not degraded by going into a pauper farm?

The distinction between the two is the receiving of money in charity from the State, or receiving help in that way, and being forced to enter into the poorhouse; but I believe every single man that I have ever met, who has been connected with the poor, says that, taking the very large majority who ought to be helped, he believes that the men who are almost starving would rather starve than go into the poorhouse. I do not think that they would have any objection to go into a pauper farm.

3886. But do you think that they would have any objection to receiving money from a sympathising friend?

On the contrary, I think they would be delighted to receive it.

3887. I thought you told the Chairman that a man would be equally degraded by receiving charity from a sympathising friend as from the State?

I do not think it would make any difference to the recipient from whom he received the money. I think if a man receives money from anybody, it is a step down.

3888. You lay a stress upon receiving money?

Yes.

3889. You think if money is given, however kindly or whether by relations or by private persons, the man is equally degraded as if he received it from the State?

I think, to the large majority of men who come and ask for money, it does not matter much from whom they receive it.

3890. I should then, in your view, consider myself as much degraded by receiving money from one of my friends when I fell into misfortune as I should by going into the workhouse?

That was not the point that I made; that is not the point that I tried to bring forward. The degradation of the poorhouse is quite a different matter; I did not know I used the word in the way you put it.

3891. Earl of Aberdeen.] Did you use the word "degraded" when you were speaking of this subject before?

I was going to say, that I was not aware I had used the actual term "degraded;" I hope that before the evidence appears I can be allowed to change it if I used it; but I do think that anybody who goes to ask for relief in money, the first time he goes he has taken a step down in his own opinion, he must inevitably have taken a step down; but, I think, what they object to principally is the workhouse.

3892. Lord Thring.] Supposing a man fell into misfortune; I will say, supposing I fall into misfortune, and go to my friends and say, "Owing to circumstances over which I have no control, either illness or loss of business, I have fallen into poverty," and those men help me, I should not myself have thought that you would think that I should feel (what is the word you wish? not "degraded") that it would have the same effect upon me as if I received relief from the State in any shape or form; do you think that a man feels the same when his friends come forward to help him as he would by going to the State?

Of course, I think it makes a huge difference whether you receive help from your relations or intimate friends, or have to go to some charitable organisation, which was in my mind when I spoke of charity. I imagine most of the poor people would be just as ready to receive from the Government a certain sum of money as they would from the Charity Organisation Society.
3893. Do you think that it is quite possible that instead of charity being administered through Committees such as the Charity Organisation Society, it ought to be done by private people themselves?
That is the highest form of Poor Law relief.

3894. And that is the least ("degrading" I must not say) displeasing form?
The least demoralising form certainly; and if that form were carried out we should have no need of any Committees on the question.

3895. If the rich gave private charity to these cases your difficulty would be removed?
The rich at the present moment are firmly of opinion that the Poor Law authorities are the people to distribute charity in this country.

3896. But if this Committee satisfied the rich that they ought to give charity in these cases, that would remove the difficulty?
Perhaps, if the Poor Law was entirely done away with altogether, and there was no system of Poor Law relief, there would be a better chance of the wealthy understanding their duties.

3897. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Has your Lordship any personal knowledge of London, south of the Thames?
Nothing, but what I have heard from those who live there. I have gone round South London and visited some of the districts there and some of the very poorest parts.

3898. Is it not the fact that a large amount of chronic destitution in any place like London is inevitable?
Certainly.

3899. Does your Lordship think that any plan can be devised that will prevent that?
I think that a great many things might be done to prevent its increasing; I think in all probability education will have a great effect. By education, I do not mean the higher branches of education; I mean technical education, such as is being advocated now by almost everybody; I think that will have a very beneficial effect upon the next generation.

3900. Does your Lordship think that the amount of destitution is increasing out of proportion to the rapid increase of population?
No, I should think not. I should like to add, that though I believe that the increase of pauperism as regards the percentage is less now than it was, that has not minimised the danger as we are increasing our population so rapidly.

3901. Can your Lordship suggest any plan of finding out, in places like London, who the people are who are on the verge of destitution?
I think that the best informants that we have at the present moment are the school board visitors.

3902. Would it be convenient or practicable to invite them to give regular information?
Certainly. They need give no names.

3903. Earl Spencer.] The attendance-officers, do you mean?
I forget what they are called.

3904. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] May I ask, do you object, on principle, to the action of philanthropic agencies, personal or corporate?
I should be very sorry if they were all done away with; but I do not think they all act very wisely in the way of administering charity.

3905. Can you recommend or suggest any suitable and efficient method of co-operation between Poor Law authorities and philanthropic agencies?
I think if you granted that the Poor Law system is the best that could be devised, and then also granted that the Charity Organisation Society was the best.
best system for administering charity, the co-operation between the two might
do a great deal, as it has done a great deal in London already.

3906. You do not see any way of preventing mischievous private benevo-
ence?
No; indiscriminate charity, as it is called, you mean?

3907. That is another way of describing it?
I am afraid I am one of those who would prefer helping a hundred people
on the chance of finding one deserving of help out of the hundred, rather than
refusing the whole of the hundred and neglecting the one who deserved the
help.

3908. But that will always be a factor in the programme?
I think that is what most people feel who are indiscriminate charity givers.

3909. Earl of Strafford.] Are you a member either of the Charity Organi-
sation Society or of the Metropolitan District Association?
I am not.

3910. You do not know the working of those two; whether they fall pretty
well into the Poor Law system, or whether they work on independent lines?
I have had a great many conversations with Mr. Loch, whose knowledge of
the matter is second to none.

3911. Should I gather correctly from the tenor of your evidence that failing
the establishment of any of those institutions, which you wish for, such as State
farms, industrial villages, the promotion of emigration, or relief works in town
and country, you are apprehensive that next winter, and in succeeding winters,
the Poor Law will not be able to grapple successfully with the increase of
pauperism in the country; do I gather that from the general tenor of the
evidence you have been good enough to give us?
I should say that it would require extra endeavours, external endeavours, on
the part of certain bodies, such as the Local Government Board and others, to
make the matter work next winter.

3912. And you think, failing the establishment of any such agencies as you
have advocated, there is every reason to apprehend that in future winters
Poor Law will not be able to grapple successfully with the pauperism?
Certainly.

3913. Earl of Aberdeen.] You mentioned that the statistics of the ratio of
pauperism per thousand, and similar statistics, could not always be relied upon
as giving an adequate representation of the actual amount of poverty compared
with pauperism?
Yes.

3914. And if it is the case that there are many who will not only suffer
destitution, but more than destitution, actual hunger, rather than resort to the
workhouse, that would imply would it not, that poverty might exist or increase
without any expectation of its being represented on the returns of pauperism?
Certainly.

3915. With regard to the School Board visitors, has it come to your know-
ledge that in a good many cases children go to school without any break-
fast?
I have been told so by the people who know the children.

3916. That would be an example, would it not, of a want of general
knowledge on the part of the public as to the extent to which poverty pre-
vails as distinct from pauperism?
Certainly.

3917. Then with reference to such a scheme as that which you suggested
in the direction of the pauper farms or pauper colonies, I think you said that
the
the persons who now avoid obtaining relief from the poor rates would in your opinion be adverse to obtaining it even in that form?

Certainly.

3918. Is it not the fact that on certain occasions when labour of various kinds has been offered as a test, before receiving relief, persons have accepted it, and then have soon deserted the work, showing that they were not really anxious to work?

I believe that has been the case.

3919. That would rather imply, would it not, that the undeserving and thriftless are not willing to resort to steady labour?

There are a very large number of undeserving, I am sorry to say.

3920. I mean in the sense of people who are really not willing to work?

Yes, not ready for steady work.

3921. However much we may admire the admirable administration in several unions which have been mentioned where out-door relief is checked, is it not rather disappointing that in some other unions where out-door relief is administered, though presumably with discrimination, the ratio per thousand of pauperism is rather lower; disappointing, I mean from the point of view that the restriction of it is a panacea?

Yes.

3922. I am alluding to a case like that of Islington, where the ratio per thousand of pauperism is 17.1, while at St. Pancras it is 21.6, though in the former case the ratio of out-door relief is larger than in the latter?

Of course you would have to take into consideration who are the inhabitants of the different districts; but I do not think one could really test that by any statistics unless there was a uniformity of method throughout all London.

3923. Then, with a conviction based upon your own observation, and the information of very experienced persons, a conviction that there is a vast amount of acute poverty, which you think is increasing, you advocate that efforts should at least be tried for alleviating that poverty?

I think it is an absolute necessity.

3924. Though, no doubt, you are aware that any scheme before it is actually tried in practice offers opportunity for theoretical criticisms?

Naturally.

3925. Such as has been suggested by some of the questions put to-day?

Certainly.

3926. Chairman.] You were just now asked whether you could fairly infer from the extent of pauperism the extent of poverty, when there might be persons who would rather almost starve than go into the workhouse; but inasmuch as all those statistics are comparative, will there not be exactly the same proportion of people who will rather suffer the extremity of hunger than go into the workhouse at one time as at another?

Is it the difficulty of ascertaining exactly what are the statistics?

3927. No; but my question is, whether the comparison will not hold good; and if you find that there is less pauperism at any given time than at another, is there any reason why comparatively you should not conclude that there is less poverty also?

No; I do not think that would exactly follow.

3928. But can you state any reason why a comparison between the pauperism of one time and the pauperism of another is not a fair indication of the comparative poverty at the one time and the other?

I do not think that it would be a fair indication to take the pauper returns now and compare them with other times, and therefore from that prove how much poverty existed in London; I do not think you could prove it by that.

(70.)

3929. Perhaps
3920. Perhaps your reason would be this, that you think the administration is more strict now than it was formerly, and that therefore the pauperism on that account would be less?

I should certainly say that, owing to the action taken by the administrators of the Poor Law lately, the numbers that appeared on these statistics would tend to prove that there was less poverty; but, in my opinion, it would not prove that, because I do not think it embraces what I should call the poor class.

3930. You think it would only prove that there is less poverty relieved out of the rates?

That is all.

3931. And you would not deny that the result is that a large number of people support themselves in some way or another who were previously supported out of public charity?

By "public charity" you mean the rates?

3932. Yes.

Certainly.

3933. Would you regard that as a satisfactory result?

If the people who were formerly supported by the rates are now supported by what I should call public charity, by some charitable organisation, or by clergy- men getting funds in some way to support them, I do not think it would make any difference.

3934. But do you not believe that a considerable number of those people are supporting themselves by their own labour and not by charity?

I think there are very few people who receive relief for a short time who ever afterwards support themselves.

3935. Did you never hear of cases occurring where men applied for relief and refused to accept it in the workhouse, and subsequently were found not to have lived by charity but by their own labour?

There may be a few such cases, but I should think very few. I am sure there are a great many who ask for relief who do not deserve it, if that is what your Lordship means.

3936. Earl Spencer.] We have had some difficulty in testing the statement that there is a large immigration of agricultural labourers into London; you spoke of knowing the fact from experience in the country, that is, in Warwickshire?

I will not limit myself wholly to Warwickshire, but principally in Warwickshire.

3937. On what did you go, any facts, such as empty cottages; what are the facts that led you to that belief that there was an exodus of agricultural labourers from those counties?

Because I have been aware of it owing to returns I have seen. As Parliamentary candidate, you have a list of all the people who live in all the villages, and you find a certain number removed from the villages, and I ask where my friend Jones or my friend Robinson has gone to, and I am told he has gone into a town, because there is no work for him in the village.

3938. Or have they emigrated?

As far as I know the only ones that have been emigrated from Warwickshire, I have emigrated myself. I daresay there may be others, but I am not aware of it.
Miss WILHELMINA L. HALL is called in; and Examined, as follows:

3939. Earl of Onslow] I think you are the Secretary, are you not, of the Association for the Advancement of Boarding Out?
Yes, Honorary Secretary.

3940. Of which Lord Cranbrook is the President?
Yes.

3941. Are you, or you have been, a Poor Law guardian?
Yes, for the last six years.

3942. Of what union?
Eastbourne Union.

3943. But your evidence today will be mainly on the subject of boarded out pauper children?
Yes; I understood that that was what your Lordships wished to examine me upon.

3944. Will you say what, in your opinion should be the duties of the Poor Law towards the children of paupers?
I think the main object of the Poor Law should be to remove the hereditary taint of pauperism from the children under its charge, because I think it is the universal experience that you can do very little towards unpauperising an adult, and the only chance of diminishing pauperism in the future is to bring up the children as far as possible without any connection with it; to remove them in fact from workhouses and pauper influences.

3945. Do you say that because you believe that pauperism is hereditary and transmitted from parent to children?
Yes, my personal opinion is very strongly that it is so. I speak there of course as a guardian. I may say that my views on boarding out are the result of my experience first as a guardian. I have gone into Poor Law matters in general very deeply, and my taking up boarding out is simply the result of seeing that the only chance of stopping pauperism at all, of stemming the tide of it, is to educate the children as well as we can.

3946. Can you give us any figures as to the number of the children under the Poor Law that are in receipt of in-door relief and out-door relief respectively?
There are 269,706 children in receipt of State relief. (My figures are taken from the last Blue Book). 55,472 of these are children in receipt of in-door relief, and those are the only children of whom I am going to speak; those in receipt of out-door relief I do not touch at all.

3947. And how many of the number you have just given are orphans?
Thirty-four thousand and eleven are orphans, or relieved without their parents; that is the form in which the relief is given in the Blue Book. That includes children who may be in hospitals or infirmaries for the moment, and it also includes a certain number, possibly 500 or 600, who are children of widows in the Metropolitan Unions, and who are, sometimes two or three in a family, taken and educated in the district school while the mother is allowed to remain out getting her own living.

3948. Chairman.] And deserted children?
Yes.

3949. Earl of Onslow.] Will you tell us how those 55,472 children are provided for in their education?
Twenty-four thousand five hundred and eighty-three are educated in workhouse or union schools; that is, in schools inside the workhouse, or in detached schools supported jointly by two or more unions, and situated at a distance from the workhouse, or possibly in the middle of the county. Then in the Metropolitan district schools, which ar also schools shared conjointly by several unions, there are 7,069. There are also 380 on board the "Exmouth" training ship.

(70).
3950. And there are children, are there not, sent to outside elementary schools?
Yes. The numbers of those are not given; I cannot obtain them from the Local Government Board; but 206 unions send their children who live in the workhouse to the elementary schools outside; and of course that is an enormous advantage to the children compared with their being educated entirely inside the workhouse.

3951. Can you give us the total number of children boarded out, included under out-door relief?
Three thousand two hundred and seventy-seven is the total number boarded out; but they are boarded out under two different orders of the Local Government Board.

3952. One of which is known as the "Boarding-Out With in" Order; the other as the "Boarding-Out Without" Order?
Yes. The number boarded out within the limits of the union area is 2,105; and those boarded out under the other Order, at a distance from the union, 1,172.

3953. Will you tell us the number of unions which board their children out under those Orders respectively?
One hundred and forty-eight unions under the first Order, Within; and only 36 under the latter Order, which send them to a distance.

3954. And what is the total number of unions?
In England and Wales 647.

3955. How many of those boarded out are under the care of certified committees?
All the children who are boarded out under the Order of 1870 without the limits of the unions; those only.

3956. What children are, under the present Poor Law, eligible to be boarded out?
A very large proportion of them; it is impossible to tell; I have asked both Sir Hugh Owen and Mr. Wodehouse, the Assistant Secretary to the Local Government Board, and Mr. Wodehouse tells me that he considers, though there are no figures to prove it, that by far the greater proportion of the 34,000 I have just mentioned are eligible for boarding out, that is, orphans or deserted children, who are not ill in hospitals or infirmaries, or the children of widows.

3957. You are not speaking of the 55,000?
No, because the 55,000 includes some 17,000 casuals or "Ins and outs" as they are called. You may add to that some 3,000 children in the workhouses who are the children of non-able-bodied parents, and who might probably with advantage be boarded out, but the present law does not allow them to be so. If you include them it would make about 20,000 who could not be boarded out.

3958. How many does that leave of the children who might be boarded out and are not?
I think I am within the mark if I say 26,000 or 27,000.

3959. They might be boarded out, but they still continue to remain in the workhouses in association with the paupers?
Yes.

3960. Are you strongly of opinion that all those children ought to be boarded out?
You will remember that among those children there will be some perhaps who are mentally incapable, and others who are physically unsuitable, for boarding out. I think there will always be a certain residuum who are only fit for some other mode of treatment, including children very delicate that you could not expect a foster parent to devote proper attention to. I have no returns of what that number is.

3961. Have
3961. Have you had an opportunity of comparing the condition of children brought up in the workhouse and that of those removed from the workhouse?

Yes, often.

3962. With what result?

That I do not think you could possibly recognise them as the same after they have been away from the workhouse for a year. In the case of my own children in the Eastbourne Union, we board out all who are eligible; we have now 21 boarded out; our workhouse is exceptionally well placed and healthy, and our children attend the elementary schools outside, yet the difference between those boys and girls two or three years ago, when they first began to go, and now, is such that I do not think anybody could recognise them as the same children.

3963. But of the different systems of removal of children from workhouses which do you consider produces the best result. I am speaking now of cottage homes, boarding out, and district schools?

I think that the cottage-home system is an extremely good one, as far as it goes; it is the nearest approach to family life which you can get in institutions.

I think the three disadvantages attached to that system are, first, the great difficulty which must be found in so large an institution as the Poor Law Cottage Home, of getting suitable "house-fathers" and "mothers" for the cottages, people who really know how to bring up the children well under the enforced conditions. They have from 20 to 30 children under their charge in a cottage; and I know, from work among private cottage homes, the difficulty we have in obtaining the services of suitable matrons who can be trusted wisely to educate children; and when it comes to supplying several in a large institution like the Banstead Cottage Homes of the Kensington Union, the difficulty must be extremely great; second, that it does not provide, any more than the workhouse, a home in after life to which the children can return, as in boarding out; third, that the respectable orphan children are subjected, as in every pauper school, to the contaminating association of children of "casuals." With these exceptions, I think it is an excellent way of bringing up children, but, however, not to be compared with boarding out. Then, as regards district schools, it is generally supposed that those who approve of boarding out are so bitter against district schools that I hardly like to compare them; but I have no personal feeling of that kind, and I think that they were a very distinct improvement at the time when they were first instituted on the terrible life of children in workhouses.

3964. Then, I think, you have a system, have you not, in London by which you follow up the boarded-out children and the workhouse children generally who have been placed in situations?

No, that affects the children brought up in metropolitan district schools only.

3965. You are connected with that society, I think, are you not?

Only incidentally; I am a subscriber and a member of it. I have a great many friends who work on it, and I know a great deal about it. It takes charge of children on leaving the district schools for their first places, and undertakes to supervise them up to the age of 21. I believe the guardians of the metropolitan unions think so highly of it now that many of them subscribe to its funds, and officially recognise the work that the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants (the "M.A.B.Y.S.," as it is called) is doing; and, I think, were it not for the useful work of this Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants we should have very much worse results of education in district schools than those we have at present. The training in the district schools, though not hurtful for the boys, is for the girls distinctly undesirable. They are, in fact, barracks. There are some 600 or 700 children in the schools; they have no individuality; they are known as numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on; they have not the chance of being called by their names. In these large district schools they can have no personal training, and they go out into the world in absolute ignorance of the details and duties of every day life; that...
must be always extremely bad for the girls. In the case of the boys, they receive industrial training in these large schools, and I do not think it so harmful to them.

3966. What is the usual fate of the children, more particularly the girls, after they have been boarded out, and are of an age to go into service?

When they are boarded out they are brought up exactly like the child of an ordinary labourer; they are taught the details of household work at home in the cottage, and when they are 14 or 15 years of age places are found for them; they form part of our servant population, and we get our servants from boarded-out children just as we do from the real children of the cottagers with whom they live. They become absolutely identified with the village in which they are brought up.

3967. Is there any system which provides for the following up of those girls after their first situation?

They are always followed up, I find, by the certified committees under whose charge they have been. I know one certified committee which is able to trace, I think, all but 20 out of 300 or 400 children they have had under their care during the last 20 years.

3968. Is it your opinion that those committees generally fulfil the duties that are imposed upon them?

I think they fulfil them excellently in most cases; but I think that the Local Government Board have been extremely remiss in that while requiring and recognising the certified committees, they have yet never taken the slightest trouble to see that their condition and their numbers are kept up. I think that is one of the chief points that requires remedying.

3969. How do you suggest that they should do so; through their inspectors or by more careful inquiries, or how?

I think probably by inspection first of all. The Local Government Board take these children from the guardians, certify a committee to take care of them, and are extremely particular about the local standing and qualities of the committee before they will accept them; after they are once certified the Board have never hitherto asked a question as to whether the Committee is dead or alive, or is doing its work, or anything of the kind.

3970. I understood you to say that the Local Government Board take these children from the guardians; does the Local Government Board accept any responsibility in the matter?

No; but they appear more or less to transfer the responsibility of the guardians to a local committee. I am not talking of it legally, but rather morally. The Local Government Board take this step; they say to the guardians: You may send your children 100 miles away; you may board them out; but if you do so you must accept the condition that we certify a Committee of ladies and gentlemen in that neighbourhood to take charge of them.

3971. Lord Balfour. Are not the reports of that committee sent to the local guardians?

Yes, quarterly.

3972. And therefore is not the duty laid upon the local guardians of making sure that that committee is doing its duty, by means of the reports which it receives?

Yes; but what I mean rather is this: that very often a committee ceases to be a committee of six, and decreases into a committee of one or two; and though the work is still perhaps just as well done, because the one or two persons do it, and so it satisfies the board of guardians, who get their report every six weeks or three months, there may be no other members left of the committee as it was originally certified by the Local Government Board; and I maintain that if the Local Government Board are so particular in certifying the committee they ought to see that it is kept up.

3973. Earl of Onslow. What I understand you to say is this: that the committee should report itself to the Local Government Board from time to time to
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the effect that all its members are still members of the committee and willing to continue the work they have begun:

Yes, it shall be required to report itself, and it is not required to do so now.

3974. But you do not contend that the Local Government Board should be responsible for the well-being of the children boarded out?

No, certainly not.

3975. Chairman.] And probably you would also desire that when any member resigns from any cause, or ceases from any cause to be a member, they should report that fact, and state whom they propose to put in his or her place?

Yes.

3976. And that the approval of the Local Government Board should be necessary?

That is necessary; the committee are bound to obtain sanction to any fresh appointment, but they are not bound, if a person on the committee has removed from the neighbourhood or dies, to report that fact.

3977. Lord Balfour.] No child can be boarded out more than five miles from the residence of some member or the certified committee, can it?

That is so.

3978. Therefore if the committee is very unduly diminished, it will very much reduce the scope of the boarding-out operations, will it not?

Not necessarily; if there are only a few children, you can usually board them out within a radius of two or three miles. The one member or six members of the committee may all do their duty thoroughly, but I think it very undesirable that the Local Government Board should not require themselves to be periodically informed of the condition and work of the committee, considering how stringent are their inquiries before a committee is first sanctioned.

3979. Chairman.] All you want is this: that in case the number is diminished from any cause, it should be reported to the Local Government Board, who should approve of the diminished committee continuing if they desire it?

Yes, or else insist on new members being added.

3980. Lord Balfour.] A committee of one is illegal; it always must be at least two, must it not?

Yes.

3981. Earl of Onslow.] But did not your answer point to this; that after a time some of the members of the committee find that one of their number is more energetic and more active than others, and they consent to abandon their duties to that one?

I did not mean that exactly. I think it is more frequently removal by death, or by circumstances from the neighbourhood, that causes the committee to diminish and leaves the work to be done by one or two.

3982. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is there not a paragraph in the regulation which says that one member will not be sufficient to do it, for the reason, that, in the case of the illness or death of the one, the child or children would drop out of sight and not be properly visited?

Yes, that is so; the Local Government Board will accept a committee of two, as you notice in the Order, and I ought to have said “two” instead of “one”; but they do not require more than two; if they are content with two on the committee to begin with, I have no objection to its remaining at two, but if they require to have four, five, or six members before they certify them as a committee, I think they should require to be informed why that committee, or if that committee, ever becomes fewer in number.

3983. Earl of Onslow.] Is it your experience that children who have been boarded out in after life are very frequently adopted by their foster parents, and in that case look upon the home in which they have been boarded out as their own home to which they can return at any time?

(70.)

Yes;
Yes; I think that is one of the very great advantages of boarding out, that the children ensure for themselves an after life, in sickness or in the intervals between their situations, a home to go to; whereas if they have only been brought up in the workhouse they generally go straight from the workhouse into their first place, and they have literally no home to return to except the able-bodied ward of the workhouse; for when they return to it they are no longer eligible for the juvenile ward of the workhouse, but must go to the adult ward, when they mix with the most vicious characters that could be found.

3984. Of course we all know that children are more liable to diseases which are easily communicated than adults; and is it your opinion that the scattering of them abroad amongst homes by the boarding-out system tends to promote their health and to prevent their communicating such diseases?

I think so. I think the great bane of the workhouse schools, if they are very large ones especially, is, as the Local Government Board Inspectors testify, skin disease and ophthalmia. I remember a report of the Hanwell School, in which 70 per cent. were stated some few years ago to be suffering from ophthalmia. Even from my own union at Eastbourne, which is exceptionally healthy, many of the children went out covered with spots, sore heads, and ailments of that kind, though not very serious; but before they were boarded out three months they were as healthy as any children in the village.

3985. And are there similar effects, do you find, on their minds, as well as their bodies?

Quite so. Into whatever workhouse one goes to visit children, they have always that hang-dog look which we are familiar with; they have no energy, no quickness; naturally their observation is confined to the limited details of life which goes on within the walls, and they do not learn to observe, as village children do, what is going on in the world around them, because they have no means of doing so; their physical energy is seldom put to the test at all. If you read the reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools in the Blue Book, they complain over and over again of the great difficulty they have amongst these children in arouses any interest or attention in their questions; and they say always that the reason is that the children are all of one class who are educated together; and also that there are no means of asking them questions in connection with the everyday occurrences of the outside world, because they never know what goes on outside, and that therefore their intelligence is extremely dulled, and they are apathetic. I have read numberless testimonies of that kind from the Local Government Board Inspectors themselves.

3986. Will you give us now a comparative statement of the cost of the maintenance of a child in the workhouse, and of a child who is boarded out?

The cost of a boarded-out child is, of course, regulated by this Order that you have before you. The maximum payment allowed is 4s. a week for maintenance; clothing, school fees, and medical attendance are allowed in addition. The maximum cost therefore comes to 13l. per head per annum; but many unions do not give so much as 4s. a head; they have the right to give less if they like; I have taken the average cost of a large number of the boarded-out children in England, and I find it is 11l. 5s. per head per annum, which includes everything.

3987. Will you now give us the cost of the children in the workhouses?

It is an extremely difficult sum to fix, because in many workhouses where loans have been contracted, they never give the cost of interest on their loans; never, in fact, in the district schools do they do that; but I have gathered, after careful inquiry, that from 4s. 3d. to 9s. 11d. per week is the sum which a child costs in the workhouse (of course the latter sum is an extremely expensive one); and I think that in country workhouses from 4s. to 5s. or 6s. would be the cost per week, all charges included.

3988. In some of the large unions, can you say what savings have been effected by adopting the boarding-out system?

In one of the reports of the Leeds Union it is stated that they board out their children,
children, under the Order of 1877, within the limits of the union, but they have
very wisely appointed an inspector of boarded out children for that purpose
only, other than the relieving officer, and they pay that inspector 130 l. a year;
and yet, in the first year that they boarded out children, they saved 1,200 l.; and
the Paddington board, also, the first year that they boarded out 40 of their
children instead of sending them to the Ashford District Schools, saved 900 l.; that
is 22 l. 10 s. per head per annum.

3989. I think that the boarding-out system is not confined to England; in-
deed, it has a much wider application in Scotland, and in some of our colonies.
Perhaps you can say what is the practice, and what have been the results in
those places?

In Scotland it has been in use for the last 40 years with the result that less
than 3 per cent. of the children boarded out have proved unsatisfactory. I had
a letter from one of the officials of the board of supervision last year, and he
said that it was an astonishment to the Scotch people that, while they had
for 40 years found the benefit of the system, we were still discussing whether
we should adopt it or not. The exact number that they board out in Scotland
is 4,467 out of 5,432 children who could possibly be boarded out. They
do there what we have no power to do, and of course it may not always
be desirable. In some cases they board out children whose parent is alive,
on condition that the surviving parent (they are mostly illegitimate children)
does not inquire where they are boarded out, and entirely gives them up. They
consider that it is more advantageous to the ratepayers to take the child, and
bring it up as a respectable member of society, even though it is paid for from
the rates, than to allow it to tramp the country with a disreputable mother.

3990. It is the almost universal practice in the Australian colonies, is it not,
to board out children?

Yes; they started with industrial schools, and, one by one, all are being
closed. (Industrial schools in the Colonies are the equivalent of our work-
house schools); they have now boarded out nearly every state child in Vic-
toria, New South Wales, and South Australia; and in Queens-land, and New
Zealand, and the other colonies, they are gradually closing their schools and
boarding out all their children. There has been an enormous saving of cost in
New South Wales; the President of the State Children's Relief Department
says it is a saving of 25 per cent. to the colony; and in South Australia, the
Chairman of the Destitute Board says they have saved 36,000 l. since they
closed their schools and took to boarding out; it was in 1872 that they
began it.

3991. If it were possible now to give a much wider application to the system
of boarding out, do you think that any practical difficulty would be encountered
in the way of providing homes for children?

Of course, when one begins to think of boarding out 20,000 children, I have
no right to give any opinion; but I am quite sure that for many thousands there
would be no difficulty whatever. The difficulty hitherto has been that, although
a number of voluntary committees have offered themselves to the Local Govern-
ment Board to be certified, and have been certified, they cannot get the chil-
dren; and over and over again I get letters saying, "We have dissolved our
committee because we have applied in vain to boards of guardians to send us
children, and we will wait no longer."

3992. And what is the ground on which the boards of guardians usually
base their objection to send the children to them?

It is simply that they know nothing about it; either they say that they have
not adopted boarding out (which is generally the answer that these committees
get), or that they are not prepared to adopt it, because they have already built
large schools.

3993. You do not think they have any doubt as to the efficiency of these
committees?

No, I think no doubt at all, but it is simply that they have not adopted the
system, that they have children educated in their own workhouse schools, or,
in the case of the metropolis, send them to the district schools; but a few of the metropolitan unions board out all their orphan children, or at least a large proportion of them, while using the district schools for others.

3994. Do you think that in those cases where the children are boarded out now, the foster parents as a rule treat them kindly, and spend the money that they receive upon the children, or that a larger proportion of it remains in their own pockets?

No, I am quite sure it does not: after the most careful inquiries I am quite sure that the foster parents are actuated by real interest and love for the children. Of course I do not say there are no exceptions, but I really think that what the late Sir Charles Trevelyan used to say about the agricultural population of England is absolutely true; that they are the very kindest towards either their fellow labourers in trouble or the orphan children of their fellow labourers; the agricultural poor are far kinder to each other than any other class in England.

3995. When children are boarded out in families, with the children of the foster-parents, do you think that they are treated in all respects equally; or do you think that the other children are apt to look down upon the boarded-out children?

I have inquired very carefully, and I also know from experience that the children who come from the unions are rather spoilt in comparison with the children of the family; they are so extremely kindly treated.

3996. Have you any experience of the manner in which the other working-men in the neighbourhood would look upon these children; would they consider that their own children were at a disadvantage compared with these boarded out and paid for children?

I have once or twice heard that objection made by persons antagonistic to boarding out; I mean by the upper classes; I have never heard a word of dislike, only words of pity and kindness, from the agricultural population themselves.

3997. Do they, after a time, after they have passed through the village schools, lose the stigma of workhouse children; do they gradually get absorbed in the population and forget that they originally came from the workhouse?

I do not think after the first three or four months the people have the slightest recollection of it, and if you went into a village school a year afterwards, I do not think they could tell you which of the children were those who were boarded out.

3998. You have told us that as a general rule, or at any rate, very frequently, the answer to applications for children from the guardians, is that they have not adopted the system of boarding out, or that they know very little about it; can you give any reason why there is this indisposition on the part of the guardians to boarding out children?

I think it arises chiefly from ignorance, and from want of information as to the advantages of boarding out. Gathering up the information I have collected as honorary secretary of the Association for the Advancement of Boarding out, I find that many boards of guardians throughout England, and even their clerks, who are often well-educated, well-informed men, lawyers even, do not know of the existence of the boarding out order; or, if they know of its existence, know nothing of its provisions; and consequently they never attempt to start the system. And then I think there is another reason: you will find in county boards of guardians, where very often they are mostly composed of ignorant (as to poor law matters) though very kindly disposed men, that anything that is not already being done will never be done, unless it is through the energy or interest of one or two individual members of the board, who are a little more go-ahead than the others; and to propose such a new departure as boarding out children, when they have for centuries past been brought up in the workhouse school, is too much for the feelings of the country guardians.

3999. Chairman.] Have you any experience of the country guardians, when you say they are so ignorant?

I did not say "so ignorant," but your London guardians, I should think, were very
very much more on the *qui vive* as to the improvements of the 19th century than the farmers of our purely agricultural countries.

4000. I suppose in some parts of the country farmers are quite as intelligent as tradesmen in the towns?

Undoubtedly.

4001. Earl of Onslow.] Is there any limitation in the number of unions that can board out children?

Yes. The Order of 1870 for boarding out children without the limits of the union has a restriction which I find however the Local Government Board is willing to remove; only those unions scheduled at the end of the Order can board out outside the union. There is no restriction to guardians boarding out within the limits of the union; and it is for that reason, I think, that you will find that the figures of those boarded out children within the union are more than double those boarded out at a distance. There is another reason, I think, why it is so little adopted; I have the authority of Lord Cranbrook himself for saying so; that is, that the Local Government Board have really only tolerated the system; they have, as Lord Cranbrook says in his pamphlet, looked upon it with jealousy and suspicion. Here are his own words: "With the officials (that is of the Local Government Board) boarding out has apparently been looked upon rather as if it were a system working in avowed rivalry with workhouse and district schools, than as a supplement to them offering to a portion of the children advantages which schools cannot give;" and I am quite sure that that is one of the chief reasons why boarding out is not more adopted. It requires that information should be given by the Local Government Board, and that at least as much facility should be given to Boards of Guardians for boarding out in the country, as there is for building workhouse or district schools; and that has never hitherto been the case.

4002. Has there been any inquiry on the part of the Local Government Board, or any report made to Parliament, as to the success of the system of boarding out, or otherwise?

I have never heard of any report of that kind, except one made in 1869 by Mr. Henley, Poor Law Inspector, on the boarding out of pauper children in Scotland, which is most favourable to the system.

4003. Would you think it an advisable thing that it should be inquired into by the Local Government Board, and a report as to its advantages or disadvantages made?

Yes, I think it would be an enormous help to boarding out.

4004. In the case of unions which have adopted the Order of 1870, do you know of any unions which have abandoned it?

No, not any. The St. Pancras Board you may remember last year brought five or six of their children back from Denmead (there was a great deal of remark about it at the time) because they were not properly housed, I gather; but they have still children boarded out with other boarding out committees and are continuing to board out; that is the only case I have heard of children being withdrawn.

4005. I think you waited upon the President of the Local Government Board, and suggested to him certain modifications of the Orders?

Yes.

4006. In reply to the deputation, I think he undertook to make certain modifications, and to consider certain others which you suggested?

Yes.

4007. Have those modifications been made?

No, they have not; but I have made further suggestions since. I had a letter from Mr. Wodehouse the day before yesterday promising that it should be done as soon as possible, but regretting that the matter did not rest in his hands. I am quite sure if those amendments were granted it would be very much to the advantage both of the children and of the committees.
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4008. Perhaps you would tell us what those amendments were?

I will give you the headings of the most important. The first Amendment which we asked for in the Order of 1870 was that every union should be admitted in schedules C. and D., instead of only those that are now named. That Amendment the President willingly acceded to. Then, that after the words "mental disease," in Article 5, paragraph 1, should be added "or permanently bed-ridden or disabled." We thought that such children ought to be allowed to be boarded out.

4009. And to that I think the President also agreed.

He agreed to that also. Then in Article 5, paragraph 2, we asked (and this was asked in order to gratify the wishes of a great many boards of guardians who had represented the desirability of it to us) to assimilate the Order to that of the Boarding-out Within Order, which allows children to be boarded out from infancy up to a certain age. Under the Order of 1870 we are only able to board out children after the age of two and up to ten, and we have asked that the Amendment may be made to "include children under the age of two, and over the age of 10, or (if this too general) to include children under two, but those above 10 only in cases of brothers and sisters of younger children already boarded out." The latter proposal the President agreed to, but not to the former, because he thought that foster-parents would be so apt to take children under the age of two merely for the object of profit. Now, the President must be very unaware of the difficulties of baby life if he supposes that a baby under two years is more tempting at 4s. a-week than a child at seven, eight, nine, or 10, because it requires double the amount of attention and care, and is a great deal more trouble to the foster-parents. In the colonies and in France they always give for their children up to two years of age double the maintenance money that they do for those above two years of age.

4010. But supposing the objection to be well-founded, would it be possible to fix a scale of remuneration according to the age of the child, which would get over that objection?

I do not think you could offer a woman less than 4s. a-week for bringing up a baby under two.

4011. I was saying, supposing the objection to be well founded?

But the President's objection ran the other way; he thought that 4s. a-week would be too great a temptation to them to take a child for what they could get out of it, under two years of age.

4012. And I say, supposing that at any age 4s. would be too much remuneration for the maintenance of a child, would it not be possible to fix a smaller sum according to the age?

It would doubtless be possible, but I think that experience in other countries shows that a child under two ought, if there is any difference made at all, to have more money paid for it, rather than less.

4013. Chairman. Is not that supposing that these women who will take these babies have not already some babies of their own; because if the woman is unable to go to work because she has a baby of her own to look after, she might, I suppose, very well indeed take charge of another baby, and not spend 4s. a-week, or anything like it upon the baby.

No, she would not expend it; but if you remember the amount of trouble a baby gives, that would not be too large a sum.

4014. In the case supposed, the woman would be able to make a decided profit out of it; do you think there would be a great temptation to undertake baby-farming for what might be got out of it?

I think 4s. is too small a remuneration to have that effect, that it would not be any temptation; and I do not think a boarding-out committee would, as a rule, give a baby to a woman who had one of her own.

4015. If you compare the 4s. that would be given for boarding out a baby with the sum given as out-relief to a woman that had a baby of her own, would not the 4s. in the rural districts be a much larger amount than the other?

Yes, but then she has the whole responsibility of that child; it is not a payment to assist, but payment for the entire charge of feeding, lodging, and bringing up somebody
somebody else's child, which, I think, makes a difference. But, however, we make no suggestion as to the sum allowed. We have again memorialised the President, in consequence of the representations of Metropolitan Boards of Guardians, to reconsider his decision and allow these children to be boarded out under two years of age, because the younger they are boarded out the more perfectly they become the children of the foster home. The President has not yet given an answer. The ground I base my desire upon is that the Board allows it in the Order of 1877, and yet it is denied to the same class of children if they are sent just outside the boundary of the union. I think the Orders ought to be assimilated. Cases coming under the two Orders may be separated only by a mile of distance, and yet are ruled by a totally different regulation. Perhaps I need not trouble the Committee with what I call the technical amendments.

4016. Earl of Onslow.] Will you proceed to give us the other amendments?

Under the Order of 1877 we asked for this amendment: "That the Order of 1877 be assimilated to that of 1870 in the creation of certified committees to superintend the boarding out, which committee shall be the means of communication between the Board of Guardians and the foster-parents." At present under the Boarding-Out Within Order the children are visited and inspected only by the relieving officer, and, therefore, though they are better off than if they were in the workhouse, they are constantly in connection with pauperism; the weekly visit of the relieving officer brings the foster-family into connection with pauperism, and they get so accustomed to the sight of the relieving officer and the receipt of relief that, though it is for a very good purpose, I think it has a deleterious influence both on the children as they grow up and on the foster-parents; I think we ought to have volunteer committees to act between the guardians and the foster-parents as we have in the Boarding-Out Without Order. That was not acceded to. Then, what I think the most important request of all, was this: "That all payments for boarded-out children shall be regarded as given on loan, so as to enable guardians to claim from a deserting parent, on returning after some years to reclaim the child, reimbursement of past expenditure on behalf of the child before it is given up, without prejudice to prosecution for desertion." I am sorry to say, that although the President stated that, as the law now stood, he believed the cost of maintenance for 12 months might be recovered, he has since let me know that he finds that he was mistaken, and there is no such power; as we were aware before we asked for the amendment. But it is perfectly outrageous that the ratepayers should be required to bring up another person's child at the cost of 50 l., or 100 l., or 300 l. or 400 l., and the moment it is able to maintain itself it should be reclaimed by relations who had deserted it for 5, 10 or 15 years, without any requirement that they should repay whole or part past maintenance. Of course they only claim it for reasons that are very improper, to make it tramp about the country or to accompany them in a dissolute career; and it seems very hard on the children after they have been well brought up by the State, and very hard on the ratepayer who has brought up the children, that these relations should be able to claim them and so perpetuate a race of vagrants.

4017. Chairman.] What you suggest is simply this: That by law the money should be recoverable from the parents or other persons who have control over the deserted child, and that, unless they were ready to pay such an amount as might be required, the child should not be restored?

Quite so; and the amendment should not apply only to boarded-out children; it should apply to all State-aided children, whether boarded out or living in the workhouse. There was a boy in my own workhouse, for whom I obtained an excellent opening in Canada; he was immediately claimed by an aunt, who sent him to the union four or five years ago, and who has since then entirely neglected him; he has become a most intelligent boy, and able to earn his own living, and she now claims him. The Local Government Board will not back my Board in preventing that child from being given up to her.
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4018. Is there any power existing anywhere to require you to give it up to her?

There is said to be a power on the part of grand parents. The aunt applied for him, and said she would take him, and my Board decided that she was not a fit person; she is a navvy's wife, and has therefore no fixed home. Hearing that, the grandmother applied for him. She has been in receipt of parish relief for many years, and we know that she cannot support the child. She says, "I claim the child and you cannot refuse him," and says at the same time that she means to pass the child on to the very aunt to whom we have refused him.

4019. You say she is in receipt of parish relief; is there not a simple mode, namely, refusing her further parish relief except in the house; she could not then take charge of the boy?

Yes; but I have Sir Hugh Owen's letter, which says that the Local Government Board feel that it is not desirable to act in opposition to the wishes of relatives even when they have no legal claim. That boy has cost us 50 l. or 60 l. to educate, and now is to be handed over to the aunt who sent him to the workhouse originally.

4020. Earl of Onslow.] You ground your contention on the fact that the ratepayers have contributed largely to the support of the child; but might not the ratepayers object if a parent, who had been some time absent, say in Australia, came back, and they were compelled to support the child, though his father claimed it, and was in a position to support it?

Yes, that is the great difficulty of such cases; but there is no ratepayer who has considered the matter even on grounds of economy, who would not rejoice in our sending him to Canada, and who would not think that we should be doing far better for the ratepayers in that way, than allowing him to be taken possession of by an aunt who has neglected him for years, because the moment she gets into bad times she will shift that boy on to the rates again. And another thing is that the ratepayers have had to expend 50 l. or 60 l. on that boy; they would rather spend 10 l. more, and know that he was well done for life, than know that in keeping the 10 l. in their pockets they are ruining that boy's future.

4021. Chairman.] The case put to you was the case of a man who came home from Australia, and could support his child, and your point is: Is it not hard that he should then take back the child after the ratepayers have expended so much money upon him; but in case the alteration of the law was made, which you suggest, the money would be recoverable?

Yes.

4022. And therefore the ratepayers would not suffer any injury?

Yes, exactly so. There are two more amendments. The next amendment we asked for was in Article V., paragraph I., that the wording should be revised so as to include illegitimate as well as legitimate children in its provisions. The Local Government Board have given their official opinion upon that clause to the St. Pancras Board of Guardians—that an illegitimate child, whose parent is under sentence of penal servitude, or suffering permanently from mental disease, or out of England, cannot be boarded out. It is only a verbal inaccuracy in the article but it has prevented Boards from making use of the permission intended.

4023. That was a mere blunder in the drawing up?

Yes. The next amendment was: "That steps be taken by the Local Government Board to maintain the efficiency of certified committees, both as regards their status and number." Then a very important one is: "That new regulations regarding payment be made, to avoid the serious inconvenience now experienced by committees owing to Boards of Guardians being unable to pay in advance." Of course it is not every president of a boarding-out committee that can afford to be 60 l. or 100 l. out of pocket every quarter, for even a very few boarded-out children; and yet the guardians have no power to pay in advance. I think
I think that ought to be remedied. Then, "that in the event of the death or removal of any member of a certified boarding-out committee, notice of the same should be given without delay to the Local Government Board." These are the most important of the amendments that we, as an Association, brought before the President of the Local Government Board.

4024. Earl of Onslow.] Now I should like to ask you a question as to your own experience of the homes in which the children are boarded-out; do you think that the committee exercise a judicious selection of those homes; do you think that they choose homes which are on an equality with the other cottages in the neighbourhood, or do you think they choose the best or less good ones?
They do not choose them even on an equality; they choose the very best, as a rule. I do not say that there are no exceptions; there must be exceptions. There are committees which I do not know in the north of England; I know most of the committees this side of Yorkshire, and I am quite sure that as a rule they select the very best foster homes in the village, and do not accept any others. The regulations as to the foster homes are so very stringent in this Boarding-out Order, that they are bound to do that, more or less.

4025. Lord Balfour.] Have you yourself visited the children in these homes?
Yes, I constantly visit.

4026. Under the Boarding-out Without Order?
Yes, those are what I am mostly acquainted with.

4027. Over what length of time has your experience in visiting the children in the homes extended?
During the last eight or ten years.

4028. Have you been seeing the children in the homes during that time who are boarded out without the limits of the union?
Yes. I visit my own children every six weeks or three months, and constantly see them besides, when visiting in the neighbourhood; but I constantly take also the opportunity of going, when I am staying in different parts of England, to visit children who may be boarded out in the vicinity.

4029. I mean actually visiting the homes in which they are placed?
I go into the homes themselves, without any notice that I am coming.

4030. And as a rule, your experience has been that they are satisfactory?
I think I must have seen in the last eight or nine years some 150 children in the homes, and I think there were only three or four cases in which I should say they were rather dirtily kept, which however by no means implies that they were not well cared for otherwise.

4031. Of course you admit that the whole success or failure of the scheme, regarded either as a whole or with reference to any particular child, hinges entirely upon the character of the home and the character of the people with whom he or she is boarded?
Decidedly.

4032. And that it is necessary to take the greatest possible care to ensure that a proper home is chosen?
Yes, undoubtedly.

4033. Do you not think that part of the hesitation, which you attribute to the board of guardians or the Local Government Board in adopting the system, has arisen from the suspicion that there is a genuine difficulty in getting proper homes?
I can honestly say that I am sure that is not the reason why boarding-out is not more largely adopted by boards of guardians. I think it is simply due to the ignorance that exists on the subject, and to the existence of large and costly school-buildings, in some cases; also perhaps it is sometimes due to an ignorant idea, that boarding out is the same kind of thing that was known some 15 or 20 years ago as baby farming; that may have something to do with it.
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4034. The unfortunate effects mentioned in the Report of 1866-67, by Miss Mason, would seem to indicate that your experience has been more favourable than the average?

My experience has certainly been more favourable than that of some cases mentioned by Miss Mason. I have been visiting as an outsider for my own information; she has gone more into detail than I have, and she has visited those committees where, I should say, especially in the Midland Counties, there was more likelihood of rough, though I do not for a moment say unkind or uncleanly, or even unsuitable homes. All through the manufacturing districts, I think, the homes would probably not be of quite the same class as those in the Home Counties or in the South-west of England; and she has visited very much among those, and made her report on them. There is one thing, I think, very important to remember, namely, that with regard to boarded-out children, by whomsoever inspected, the standard which is required either for their food or their clothing or their accommodation should not be in any way above that of the children in the village. Now, I would have the children very thoroughly inspected and cared for; you cannot be too particular; but I would not spoil them, and I would not make an undue fuss over them; and I think there is a tendency in the present day to require for these State-aided children such accommodation, food, and clothing as no one would deem requisite for the well-cared for child of the respectable labourer; I think that a great mistake; and if that is the line which inspection takes in the future, it will very much stop boarding out, because the small ratepayer and the respectable labourer will say that it is very unfair to them to pauperize the children of those who have made no attempt to provide for their families, and so have cast them on the State.

4035. At the same time, do I understand you to advocate that less care shall be taken, and to contemplate the possibility of boards of guardians allowing children under their charge to be boarded out under sanitary conditions which we would all condemn, though we may not have the power to remedy them in the case of children living with their own parents?

Certainly not. The strictest sanitary arrangements should be required, and the standard of accommodation, food, and clothing required for boarded-out children, should be that of the best of our most respectable cottage families.

4036. Under this Order, what are the conditions to which you object?

I do not object to any in the Order.

4037. I thought you said they were too high a standard?

No; I say that they are so stringent that the Committee is bound to be very particular in the choice of the home; I do not think that they can be too stringent.

4038. You have not got in the Order itself the recommendation of the Local Government Board as to what the homes should be; they are contained in a letter of instructions?

Yes; the letter of instructions was issued with the order.

4039. You mean the letter under date the 25th of November 1870?

Yes; and you will find the recommendations contained in it are always considered quite as binding as the Order itself as to how the homes should be chosen. I consider them as entirely obligatory.

4040. To which of those recommendations do you object, if any?

Not any; I consider that they are excellent.

4041. I do not quite understand what you would have the Local Government Board do in regard to these regulations, except the modifications you have specifically suggested?

That is all we want the Local Government Board to do; to amend the Order itself in the ways I have enumerated; not to touch the recommendations; I think they are most excellent.

4042. But the experience given us in the Report of 1886 is not particularly encouraging
encouraging regarding the way in which some at least of the committees have carried out the duties entrusted to them?

If that is so, that is all the more reason for carrying out our suggestions for maintaining their efficiency. I think you will see, however, if you read it carefully and between the lines, that there is no very serious allegation against those committees; it is simply that they are not perfect; and that is the very reason why I want the Local Government Board, which certifies them, to keep up their standard of efficiency. I think it is much more important to inspect the committees than it is to inspect the children; because if the committees are efficient and well selected you may be sure that no case of ill-treatment or insufficient food or improper accommodation will be found in the foster homes.

4043. You would agree with me in this, that if the home is not good and properly chosen, inspection can do very little to prevent abuse and to help the child: that if a home is not initially well chosen, no inspection can do any good at all; you cannot pretend to keep unsuitable foster parents in order by any system of inspection you can devise?

I should hardly think so. I object to children being put with unsuitable parents entirely. It is not necessary; there are thousands of respectable agricultural people in England fit to bring up children, and take charge of them; and I should object entirely to a child being boarded out in an unsuitable home, or with unsuitable parents.

4044. With regard to the payment, I think you were mistaken in saying that the 4 s. included the allowance for clothing?

I said that the maximum cost of boarding-out in England is 13 l. per head per annum, which includes maintenance, clothing, schooling, and medical fees; the 4 s. weekly is for food and lodging only.

4045. Because the weekly sum, the maximum of which is fixed at 4 s., is specially said to exclude clothing?

Yes, boards of guardians usually allow 7 s. 6 d. to 10 s. a quarter for clothing; that is the usual allowance; but it is left to their discretion, and varies considerably. The allowance for medical attendance is usually 2 s. 6 d. a quarter, or is given as required.

4046. Your comparison between the relative expense of children kept under one system and under another, assumed that the 4 s. did include the clothing, I think?

No; I only took for comparison 13 l. a year for boarding-out as against the cost of maintenance in the workhouse. I mentioned the 4 s. as being the weekly sum allowed by the Local Government Board to be given to foster parents for the maintenance of children. The total cost of a boarded-out child per annum is 13 l., that is 5 s. a week; the total cost of a child brought up in the workhouse is from 4 s. 3 d. to 9 s. 11 d. per week; and the total cost of a child brought up in a district school varies from 7 s. 4 d. to 15 s. 5 d. per week, that is from 19 l. to 40 l. per head per annum. That is an enormous difference. And I might add, if you want evidence on cost, that the cost of the maintenance of the children in the Metropolitan Poor Law unions alone has risen from 97,000 l. in 1871, to 163,000 l. in 1885 exclusive of school fees; so that the expenditure is constantly increasing for children brought up in district schools.

4047. You are not aware, perhaps, that in the year you have mentioned there was a great increase in the number of the sick poor relieved?

But I am speaking only of the maintenance of the children.

4048. But sick children are included in the total?

Yes, it includes them; but, on the other hand, the number of children chargeable during those years has not increased at all in proportion, and I think the outlay has arisen from the enormous schools built and continuing to be built, and the great outlay on the luxuries connected with them.

4049. Earl of Aberdeen.] Wish regard to the position of the guardians, the guardians have means, have they not, of securing the continued efficiency (70.)
of the committees appointed to look after these boarded-out children; or have they no means?
They have no other means than requesting the Local Government Board to insist on their efficiency.

4050. Reporting to the Board any matters that they do not consider satisfactory, you mean?
They might possibly do so.

4051. I gather that they do not look very sharply after the continuous efficiency in point of numbers?
As long as they receive the six-weekly report which the committee are bound to give, they are perfectly content, as a rule.

4052. As to inspection, you approve of the careful inspection which is carried out under the authority of the Local Government Board, and the strict regulations which are enforced as to matters of sanitary arrangement and conduct on the part of the foster parent?
I most thoroughly approve of the strictest regulations being made and enforced as to sanitary arrangements, and the character and conduct of foster-parents; I consider also that careful and thorough inspection is necessary from time to time, both for the sake of the children, and for the assurance of the guardians, my Association has always urged it most strongly. I can give no opinion on the method of inspection lately adopted by the Local Government Board; the appointment for the first time of an inspector for the sole purpose of inspecting boarded-out children, is too recent to obtain sufficient data on which to form an opinion. But speaking generally, I consider the appointment of an inspector for that one duty alone, and of a lady as the inspector, distinct improvements on former modes of inspection, which has hitherto been usually undertaken by Her Majesty's Poor Law Inspectors in the course of their other work in the districts to which they are attached.

4053. Earl of Onslow.] Do you consider the present inspection of boarded-out children by Miss Mason, who, I think, is the only inspector of boarded-out children, sufficient?
She has only been appointed during the last two years, and of course one can hardly give an opinion yet; she has not visited half the boarded-out children yet, and I do not suppose that any one person could manage to inspect, regularly, all the children; it would of course depend entirely on how often they would be visited.

4054. That was not the inspection you expressed yourself satisfied with to Lord Aberdeen?
No, I was speaking of inspection generally.

4055. Earl of Aberdeen.] Inspection generally, which would include that?
Yes.

4056. Chairman.] Are you at all able to tell us how that cost of children in workhouses in calculated; because it seems very strange that it should amount to the enormous sum of 9 s. 11 d. a week; do you know on what basis it is calculated?
I believe, but I will not bind myself to this, that it is on the average number of inmates during the half-year and the total cost of the half-year. Of course when one mentions that sum it is only in very few workhouses that such expenditure occurs.

4057. It may be quite possible that the cost, taken with reference to the building of the workhouse and the establishment charges and so forth, may amount to a certain sum per head. It does not follow that there will be a saving of the difference supposing the children are boarded out; because the workhouse being there, the removal of any inmates from it would tend to increase the cost as regards those who remain?
Yes, I am quite aware of that objection being made, but there will be a decrease in salaries of school-masters and in other expenditure incurred only for the children.

4058. Therefore
4058. Therefore it would not be correct to say that the guardians would gain by boarding out children in all cases in the existing state of things.

I think even in the existing state of things, and taking into account what you have mentioned, they would still gain. You have the testimony I mentioned of the Leeds Union who say that they saved 1,200l. in the first year that they boarded out 130 children. My opinion is further borne out by a statement in last year's report received from the Leeds Union; the comparative cost is there given as follows: Cost in Leeds Union before boarding-out, exclusive of buildings, 7 s. per week; present cost of children in workhouse, with children going out to elementary schools, and without industrial training, 5 3 s. 2 d. per week; boarded out children, including everything, 4 s. 7 d. per week. It is a difficult question, but I have gone into it very carefully.

4059. It is extremely difficult, without knowing accurately the expenditure, to come to any conclusion as to the precise comparison of cost.

Yes; as to the precise comparison; but as to the general comparison, I have no hesitation in saying that in pounds, shillings, and pence boarding-out is an enormous economy to the ratepayers; in what proportion I should find it more difficult to say. I have here particulars of four methods of pauper education at work within the same area, which I obtained two years ago, when reading a paper before the Birmingham meeting of the British Association. I took for comparison the methods in use in or around Birmingham. In the case of the Aston Union Workhouse, the cost was 13 l. 4 s. 4 d. per head per annum; that was just outside Birmingham. In the West Bromwich District Schools, used by some of the Birmingham guardians, and close by also, it was 18 l. 4 s. per head per annum. In the Marston Green Cottage Homes, used also by some of the Birmingham guardians, it was 21 l. 11 s. 2 d. per head per annum; and in the King's Norton Certified Boarding-Out Committee, which also works in and around Birmingham, the average cost was 10 l. 18 s. 3 d. You have there the cost of four different modes of bringing up pauper children within the same area.

4060. You were asked several questions as to the apparent reluctance of many boards of guardians to adopt the boarding-out system, especially out of their own union; may not that arise from a feeling, perhaps, of unnatural distrust of certified committees, of which they know nothing, and the children being taken to a great distance, where they have no possible means of knowing how they are treated?

I should not use the word "reluctance"; I think boards of guardians do not board-out simply for the reasons before stated. The fact of there being only 2,000 boarded out within the union area, where the Guardians can have the children under their eye, and 1,000, roughly speaking, outside, shows that in the minds of the guardians there is not much to choose between the two methods, and also proves that distrust of certified committees at a distance is not the cause of boarding-out being so little adopted.

4061. You spoke of there being thousands, as, no doubt, there are many thousands, of respectable labouring people who might take charge, and would be fit persons to take charge, of boarded-out children, do you think there are a very large number who are willing as well as fit?

I know at the present moment, without any inquiry whatever, simply in the course of my work as honorary secretary of the Boarding-Out Association, that there are some 250 or 260 vacancies among the small number of certified committees which already exist, in homes which are ready to receive children.

4062. Then your experience has not shown you what I have heard to be the case in some unions, that there are not many persons found fit and willing to receive boarded-out children?

No, I must say that my experience is not that; but I can quite imagine that in certain unions and in certain parts of England it would be impossible and undesirable to board out children.

4063. Lord Balfour of Burley. Did I understand you to say that the number of children boarded out was so large that they had not been, or could not be, properly inspected by the Inspector of the Local Government Board?
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(No, ...
No, I did not say that, but that the inspector had only within the last two years been appointed; it is the first time that an inspector has been appointed for the sole purpose of inspecting boarding-out children, and the plan is now in course of trial; it is not a permanent appointment.

4064. You are not aware, perhaps, that during that time Miss Mason has visited nearly all the children boarded out under the order of 1870?
Yes, but not the children boarded out under the order of 1877.

4065. That is not her duty?
No, because the Board consider that those children are under the care and supervision of the relieving officer; but the children boarded out under the order of 1877, under the eyes of the guardians, as it were, are, I know, not unfrequently ill-treated and badly fed.

4066. Your argument would be there should be a stronger staff of inspection, as well as enlarged duties of the inspector; not that the work which was put into the hands of the inspector has not been adequately discharged?
Not in the least; I said nothing about that.

4067. Then I understand that you think that it is not safe to allow the system of boarding-out within the union with inspection by the relieving officer and the medical officer of the union only?
I did not say that it is not safe; but I think if children put under the responsibility of ladies and gentlemen of known position and character, scattered throughout England, have to be inspected by a Government Inspector (which I think very excellent), then those who are placed within unions simply under the charge of a relieving officer, who is very often not at all well adapted for the work, ought to be inspected too. I think that cases of ill-treatment are far more likely to arise under the latter than under the former method.

4068. Chairman.] Then I understand that you think that there ought to be no boarded-out children who are not inspected by a Government Inspector from time to time?
And who are not looked after by a certified committee.

4069. But you think that they ought to be inspected by a Government Inspector?
I do, but not too frequently.

4070. And that there should be a certified committee in every union where boarding-out is allowed?
Yes, whether within or without.

4071. But would it not probably happen in some unions that no certified committee could be formed, and therefore there could be no boarding-out?
Surely there is always at least the rector and rector’s wife and one other resident in every Poor Law union. It would be the exception, I think, where a committee could not be formed; but it does not of course follow that every Poor Law union, or indeed every village is a desirable area for boarding-out.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, at Twelve o’clock.
Die Jovis, 21° Junii, 1888.
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THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY, K.G., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. CHARLES LOCH, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

4072. Chairman.] You are Secretary to the Charity Organization Society?
Yes.

4073. Can you give us any evidence as to concerted action between the Poor Law Authorities and voluntary agencies for the relief of the poor?
Yes, I think I can, in part.

4074. Would you state what you have to say on that subject?
With regard to several districts, there is very fairly continuous co-operation between the Poor Law Authorities, and, for instance, our own committees.

4075. What form does that co-operation take?
At Kensington, for instance, cases which apply to the guardians, but which seem suitable for charitable rather than Poor Law relief, are referred to our local committee, and in that way cases in which misfortune is the cause of distress are dealt with.

4076. Could you at all give us a notion of what the dividing line is between the cases which may be said to be proper cases for relief by the rates, and the cases which you would regard as being more properly relieved by charity?
Generally speaking, we adopt the Poor Law definition, for Poor Law cases, destitution. Cases in which we think we can place the family or individual in a better position in life, we most gladly take up.

4077. You have regard, no doubt, to the character of the persons?
Yes; the character and, generally speaking, the possibilities of helping.

4078. Your object is to place them in such a position, if possible, that they may not be again obliged to have recourse to charitable assistance?
Certainly. I have a note, for instance, of what was done at Kensington. Mr. Edgcombe could give further evidence; he is our honorary secretary there, and a member of the Board. He says:—"We start with the principle that Poor Law deals only with actual present destitution, and gives its help only in a distasteful form, with certain obvious exceptions, e.g., the blind, the lame, and the imbecile. With these the State might with advantage deal more liberally than at present. Our aim is that (1) no one should be allowed to fall on the Poor Law otherwise than in consequence of misconduct, including gross improvidence; and that (2) no one should remain chargeable whom charity can extricate, and can make self-supporting. Considerable efforts have been at various places..."

(70.)
times made towards both these objects by the Charity Organization Society and others acting with them. 1. Prevention. The guardians and their officers have been invited to call the attention of the Charity Organization Society and Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants to any suitable cases. This has specially been done in times of anticipated exceptional distress. Guardians themselves at relief committees intercept and refer to Charity Organization Society hopeful cases; and representatives of the Charity Organization Society have frequently been in attendance while these committees have been sitting. These efforts have not been so regular or so systematic as they should have been; but enough has been done to enable the administrators of the Poor Law to feel pretty sure that hard cases will have a fair hearing beyond the official judgment of the guardians. 2. The guardians, very much at the instance of this committee and of its members, have for many years encouraged charitable societies to do what they can to befriend the inmates of the House. All fresh arrivals are examined by the Visiting Committee, several of whose members belong to the Charity Organization Society, and these at once note any case apparently suitable for charity. A representative of the committee is usually in attendance for the purpose of taking particulars. A committee of ladies meets regularly at the House to examine persons seemingly fit for service outside, and to help them to situations. Another committee deals specially with fallen women. The assistance given by these various agencies is very considerable. The cases dealt with, generally speaking, have been (apart from cases helped from the infirmary) workmen in want of tools, clothes, or a temporary start; boys and girls requiring places, fallen women, deserted mothers, and, rarely, deserving old persons for whom some permanent help is required. Trustworthy statistics about cases thus dealt with are producible. Speaking quite roughly, some 50 at least were helped last year. With regard to the category of deserted mothers, those, as a rule, we leave entirely to the Poor Law Authorities; but there might be exceptional cases of old-standing desertion in which we would intervene. At Whitechapel, too, there is a close system of co-operation; I think they returned over 90 cases dealt with through our Charity Organization Committee there in the course of the half-year; that was mentioned in the Report of the Clerk to the Board, Mr. Vallance.

4079. Are there any other unions in which you have special co-operation with the guardians?

I think there is very good co-operation in St. Pancras; throughout London we get information from the relieving officers as to the cases that we deal with; but the co-operation varies much in the different districts; it is distinctly on the growth in some.

4080. Have you observed that this system of co-operation has had an effect in diminishing the amount of out-door relief?

I think it has; at least where there has been this co-operation there has been the reduction.

4081. Perhaps before we proceed further, you would give us a statement of the general organisation of your society, and of the mode of its working?

The plan of organisation is as follows: We wish to have one or more district committees in each Poor Law union, taking the Poor Law union as the basis of our work, and endeavouring as far as possible to co-operate with the guardians in that union.

4082. Earl Spencer.] Of the metropolis, do you mean?

The area that we adopt for the metropolis is what is generally called the metropolitan area, covered by the Metropolitan Poor Law Unions and the Metropolitan Board of Works. And at each of these offices there are a certain number of voluntary workers. There is also a paid officer, sometimes an agent only, sometimes two, sometimes a secretary and an agent. They receive applications in a certain form with a view to ascertaining as thoroughly as possible what the cause of distress is, and then they endeavour, by co-operation with other charitable agencies, to obtain what is required for the individual case. Our object is, roughly speaking, what we would call adequate relief, co-operation, thorough inquiry, and the development of trained personal work. In connection
connection with this organisation in London we have at the centre a council which makes grants to the committees in the poorer parts of London; they depend mainly on these grants. The council also affords conveniences of several kinds to the committees. It is the meeting place for the society at large. We have a plan for the supply of convalescent accommodation by arrangements made on our own part with the homes; we have also certain facilities for emigrating cases that come before us; and then there is a committee which has charge of the district work generally, before which any complaints or any questions that refer to the administration of the various district committees come. Then outside London we are in communication with a large number of charity organisation societies in other parts of London; and also there are societies in America with whom we have to do. A list of them is published in the Annual Report which I have here, if the Committee care to see it.

4083. Chairman. A list of those in England?
Yes, of those in England, and also the charity organisation societies in America; there are a great many there.

4084. Is it a very long list?
Yes, it is a long list. There are a good many in England, and a good many in Scotland. That, I think, gives a general idea of our plan.

4085. Will you add what the sources of income are?
The income is entirely obtained from voluntary sources. Exclusive of loans and returnable grants, about two-thirds of the relief money is raised upon the individual cases, by getting other people and institutions to help as far as possible. Other relief money is received and expended for special purposes, e.g., convalescent cases, surgical appliances, and emigration. The loans and returnable grants amounted to 1,542l.; the grants from the general funds of the district committees to about 4,821l. The total amount that passed through our hands for relief purposes, one way and another, in 1886-7, amounted to 26,247l. Our expenses on organisation, including publications and convalescent work, and so on, amounted in all to 15,053l.; the details are given here. The general expenses of district committees amounted to 9,337l. And then we have expended on district secretaries towards which sums are especially contributed by various supporters of the society, 1,054l. Roughly speaking, I take it that a district committee costs about 260l. a year on an average. You must have a good office, an office where you can see your applicants separately; you must have responsible officers, and that, together with the expense of rates and taxes, would amount altogether, I think, on an average, to about 260l.

4086. Could you say how many cases in the course of the year you dealt with?
The cases run, on an average, I should say to about 26,000; last year the number of applications, by residents, was 25,533.

4087. How many of those received assistance in money?
Fourteen thousand and one.

4088. How much of your expenditure was distributed amongst these 14,000?
Do you mean how much of our own funds that we spent on relief?
4089. Yes?
Apart from the money we raise on cases, do you mean?
4090. Can you tell me the money altogether?
I have mentioned the total relief.

4091. Will you state the amount you gave from your own funds, and then add the amount which passed through your hands, contributed by other persons outside?
Including sums received and expended for special purposes, such as convalescent relief, &c., but excluding loans and returnable grants, the total spent from the funds of the society for relief would amount to about 8,534l. A good deal
deal of money is given upon the recommendation of the society by those who have sent cases to it for inquiry and advice. We help people to do their private charity in that way.

4092. Lord Thring. I think that, as far as I understand it, the measure of the money which you state passes through your hands as relief money is no measure at all of the money which you are the cause of giving to the poor; what I mean to say is, you cause people to a very large measure indeed to give money, to the poor, and to deserving cases, that does not pass through your hands at all?

Yes, certainly.

4093. And, consequently, the measure of the beneficence, of which you are the cause, is out of all proportion to the actual money which you spend as relief money?

Certainly. Our position would be, not to be that of a relief society, but only so far as it is absolutely necessary, from our own funds, to give what relief is necessary; we should throw upon the persons interested as far as possible and other charitable agencies the actual giving of relief.

4094. Chairman. I think you were about to give us some evidence of the effect on out-door relief of your system?

I should imagine that evidence to a certain extent had already been submitted to you. The Whitechapel and St. George's in-the-East committees are two where there has been a continual decline in out-door relief, and continuous co-operation with the local committees. Then at Paddington, I understand that there has been since 1884-85 or thereabouts a return to the out-door relief policy, and there has certainly been less co-operation between the local committee and the board of guardians since that time. I have here returns taken from the published Returns showing that since 1884, with the exception of a drop in 1887, there has been a continual increase, whereas from 1878 there has been in some instances a remarkable decrease.

4095. Could you give us the figures?

The totals of the first week of January, beginning 1878-79 year by year onward, ran this way: In 1878, 1,771; then 1,530, then 1,340, then 1,295, then 1,230, then 1,224, then 1,184; then, in 1885, these are the figures: 1,202; in 1886, 1,278, then 1,192, the drop I referred to; and then 1,332; that is this year.

4096. Do you attribute that increase during the last year to the more free giving of out-door relief, or may it be ascribed to exceptional distress?

I should attribute it myself to a change of policy. Besides that, one might compare, for instance, Whitechapel; I have got the January and July returns of the same period from Whitechapel.

4097. Were you giving the January and July returns just now?

I was giving only January. I will therefore stick to the January returns, in the case of Whitechapel. I will not weary you by running through these figures, but in 1888 the figures are 1,365, a very small increase; and there has not been the variation in that instance that there has been in Paddington. I think, therefore, the variation, on the whole, may fairly be attributed to what I believe is the acknowledged fact: a change in the system.

4098. Would you give the succession of figures, as you gave in the other case?

1,321; 1,505; 1,484; 1,562; 1,539; 1,534; 1,499; 1,447; 1,343; 1,286; 1,365.

4099. But the last year shows, in Whitechapel as well as in Paddington, a considerable increase over the previous year?

Yes; an increase of 79.

4100. I observe,
4100. I observe, however, that the total pauperism in Paddington is still low; because, by a return which I have before me of the mean number of paupers relieved on the 1st of July 1887, and the 1st of January 1888, the total per thousand of population in Paddington was 11.4; and the number of cases of out-door relief is only 3.4. In Whitechapel no doubt the ratio of out-door relief is smaller, and the total proportion of pauperism is somewhat larger, 16.1. That may be accounted for, of course, by the more impoverished condition of that union?

Yes.

4101. But still the total per thousand in London being 24.2, the amount of pauperism in Paddington for the last two half years was considerably less than half that for the whole of London?

Yes, relatively it is less; but, of course, comparing 1878, we have a great drop, for it was then 1771; therefore if there is a gradual progression upwards, as there has been a gradual progression downwards, given another seven or eight years, and they might well recur to the position of 1878.

4102. Are there any special classes of cases in which you think there might be more cooperation than there has been up to the present time?

Yes, certainly. There is one very difficult class of case; that of the afflicted, the feeble-minded, and epileptic, the deaf, the dumb, the blind, and the deformed. In all these cases the permissive powers of the guardians give them a very strong position for helping others who are working outside. These Acts are being enforced, I think, considerably more than they were; still their powers are very large, and they could be most beneficially used, I think.

4103. To what powers do you refer?

First, those contained in the 4th and 5th William IV., chapter 76, the 1832 Act. It enables the blind and deaf and dumb children to be maintained and educated out of the rates without entailing disabilities on the parents. Then in 1863 there is another Act which enables the guardians to send blind, deaf and dumb, lame, deformed, or idiotic children to schools certified by the Local Government Board. Then the Act of 30th and 31st Victoria, chapter 106, enables the guardians to pay for any adult pauper, being blind or deaf and dumb, to any hospital or institution established for such persons. Then there is the 31st and 32nd Victoria, chapter 122, which enables guardians, with the consent of the Poor Law Board, to send an idiotic pauper to any establishment for the relief of idiots, whether maintained out of the rates or by private subscription; and also to send any poor deaf and dumb or blind child to any school fitted for its reception. Then there is the Act of 1867, which allows the guardians to subscribe to any asylum or institution for the blind or deaf and dumb, or to any other institution calculated in their opinion to render useful aid in the administration of the relief of the poor. So that their powers of assisting in these ways are very large.

4104. Would the expense be greater to the guardians of dealing with cases in that way, instead of keeping these afflicted paupers within their workhouses?

Possibly it might; but, on the other hand, I think in not a few cases, the institutions would be willing to receive these afflicted persons on the payments which the guardians would make, estimating what it cost them in the house, the rest being made good by the contributions which would naturally come to the institutions. Of course it is very difficult to know how to deal with these cases, particularly with regard to the weak-minded, and girls of that class who have possibly left the workhouse schools in a condition in which they cannot get on in service; and they could very well be assisted by this means. We have no institutions at present, without some sort of indirect bounty of this kind, which would meet the difficulty.

4105. It would act as a great inducement to the guardians to avail themselves of these institutions if the expense to the rates is not increased thereby?

(70.)
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Yes.
Yes. Mrs. Whateley, the honorary secretary of the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, has been very closely into the question regarding that class, and could, I am sure, give very interesting evidence.

4106. Does your Association work much in conjunction with the clergy and other ministers of religion?

That varies very much with the districts. In some places we do a great deal with them. Of course there are difficulties in the way, I mean it is a question of time to a certain extent—the acquisition of a common basis for work. And then again, of course the district visiting system is largely connected with the special religious work of the clergy, and the difficulty of the organisation of the charitable relief is very largely increased by the fact that there are so many different sectarian associations which each pull their own way. However, there is a distinct change of thought in the matter, I think, and very much more willingness to co-operate in some directions; and also I think there is a greater attempt to deal thoroughly with the cases, and to take more trouble in finding out the facts about them than there used to be. If any system of training could be introduced among visitors, it would have a most beneficial result; and I think, also, that it would be a good thing if the bishops were, if it were possible, to bring forward this side of the work of the priest or deacon before ordination. It seems to me that so many men come into parish work with very little special training in this department; and I am sure, judging from what has been told me myself, they fully realise that difficulty.

4107. Are you of opinion that it is possible or advisable to introduce into this country any such system as exists at Elberfeld, or charitable relief?

I think we could assimilate our system slowly to something approaching the Elberfeld system; but the Elberfeld system has the advantage of being official, that is to say, the almoner has a sort of honorary post in the State; and then again the supervision at Elberfeld is extremely strict, far stricter at any rate than most parishes, and most charitable people would at present submit to. Then again there would have to be a division of London into small districts, which at present is hardly possible. Further, the Germans at Elberfeld are very proud of their citizen duties, and they work very hard to fulfil them; and in London, it would be extremely difficult at present to find the men, at any rate the trained men, indeed one might say, to find the men at all, who would fulfil such duties well. The whole system of German life is so different. There, of course, every individual is a taxpayer; and here, a very large number of those who live in small tenements never pay anything but their rent, because the landlord has arranged, under the Small Tenements Act, and the collection of Poor Rates Assessment Act, to pay in lump the rates over to the authorities; and from this and other causes there is, I think, not that reality of citizenship here that there is abroad. That is a point that was mentioned in the Report of the Royal Commission on Friendly Societies, and I have heard it mentioned several times by persons able to form a judgment on the subject; and I cannot see how we can introduce such a system as that of Elberfeld into London, until we have, if I may say so, a development of citizenship.

4108. Do you think that what you term the development of citizenship, as regards charitable relief, really applies to the class whose rates are paid by their landlord; is it not a class somewhat above those to which you must look for carrying on an organised charitable system?

That is true; but, at the same time, I think that if we are to adopt the standard of Elberfeld, we should have to get in altogether a different class from that which takes the leading part in charitable administration in London; I think that we should have to look forward to getting the best of the local people; certainly the working-class, certainly the tradesmen; and I think also that, apart from the direct intervention in municipal work of the class which would be affected by the Acts I have referred to, this throws upon them a distinct position in the community which has its value. It goes, I think, with much else in our system.

4109. So
4109. So that on the whole you scarcely look forward to the possibility of establishing such an organization of relief as exists at Elberfeld?

There is this possibility about it, I think, if it does not lead one quite too far a-field to refer to it. Dr. Strassmann, at Berlin, suggested that there should combine the administration of their voluntary charities and their endowed charities, and separate them entirely from what might be called Poor Law relief. Now on that basis it would be quite possible, I think, to give a quasi official position to the administrators of charity, and that might be done, possibly, in connection with the re-organisation of the City parochial charities which is now going on, and which is in the hands of the Charity Commissioners. Of course that is rather a broad view to take of the matter; but at the same time it is a question whether in the changes that may come about in the course of the next few years, it would not be reasonable to deal with the administration of charitable relief generally, and to bring charitable institutions into some kind of combination, or, at any rate, to recognise them in some way. At present the whole of our system is voluntary. It is rather chaotic; in fact, the endowed charities are administered without any special reference to the voluntary charities. There are also the parochial voluntary charities, which may be administered without any reference to the endowed charities. There are the chapels also, and there are the very many individuals who intervene, and the very many societies. The money in London seems to me quite sufficient. I have got returns here, and they are very moderate; they would bring up the endowed and voluntary relief, irrespective of what is given directly, and of one or two other sums for which I cannot estimate, to under 3,000,000 l. a year. The actual figures of the Estimate are: I. City Companies, 110,000 l.; II. City Parochial Charities (endowed), excluded under reorganisation by the Charities Commissioner. III. Endowed Charities, Middlesex (Metropolitan), 9,294 l. IV. Endowed Charities, Surrey (Metropolitan), 23,945 l. V. Endowed Charities, Kent (Metropolitan), 13,136 l. VI. Voluntary Parochial Charities, 54,750 l. VII. Nonconformist Churches and Chapels, Voluntary Charities, 32,850 l. VIII. Voluntary Institutions, 2,183,720 l. IX. Magistrates’ Poor-boxes. X. Charitable relief given direct, apart from endowments of any kind, agencies connected with church and chapel, or voluntary institutions. XI. Charitable relief given from benevolent fund of trade and friendly societies, or in connection with such societies. Total 2,457,695 l.

4110. Distributed in London, do you mean?

In London; and that is irrespective of the educational charities and irrespective of the City parochial charities.

4111. Is that amount only voluntary charity, or does it include anything beyond:

It includes the endowed charities of the City Companies, including about 75,000 l. that is expended on almshouses and the relief of poor members. It includes the endowed charities of Westminster and Middlesex, and the metropolitan parts of Kent and Surrey, excluding what would be set down for educational purposes, clerical purposes, and so forth. It includes the voluntary institutions of London, excluding there again educational charities and certain others which have nothing to do with relief; and it includes the voluntary parochial charities; I have taken these as on an average equal to 150 l. all round; and it includes congregational charities, which I take at about 50 l. all round. That is a matter of estimate, but I have done my best to get a fair estimate.

4112. Lord Thring.] “All round” means on an average?

Taking the parishes on an average, I mean.

4113. Chairman.] From your experience, should you say that a very large sum of the money so spent may be said to be misdirected, and frequently to do as much harm as good, if not more?

I think there is no question at all that that is so. I have got a few cases here now which are picked up out of an inquiry which was made by a Mr. Freeman (70.)
a couple of years ago, out of 500 Marylebone cases taken at random. They have been very elaborately analysed, and they come from all sources.

4114. Earl Spencer.] What do you mean by "cases."
Cases that have applied to our society. I will just mention one or two.
Here is one. I will not mention the Church district. "Gives one ticket fort-nightly to a man who drinks, and lives in one room with his wife and a child aged 12, and a female lodger who also drinks."

4115. Lord Thring.] These are cases of private charity:
Cases of parochial charity.

4116. When you say "gives a ticket," you mean that the person gives a ticket?
I meant that the charitable person administering relief in the parish gives tickets.

4117. Voluntary relief?
Entirely voluntary relief. Then here is another instance; I will leave out the nominative; "Gives tickets to two persons who drink and fight; they are not married, but the woman has or had a husband, but does not know if he is living."

4118. Earl of Milltown.] What do you mean by "drinks"; does it mean in the habit of getting drunk?
Yes, drinking habitually.

4119. Earl of Strafford.] Who gives these tickets?
Visitors, and people connected with the churches.

4120. What are the tickets?
What is ordinarily called a coal or bread ticket, a ticket which can be exchanged for goods at some tradesman’s in the district.

4121. But not issued by your society?
No not issued by us. Then another instance is, "Gives coal, bread, and dinner tickets to a couple who both drink; the man is dishonest, and has been in prison for assaulting his wife." And so I might go on. Here is another; "A man who owes 84 s. rent, and has 7 l. in pledge, and is in a hopeless state, received a meat ticket and half-a-cwt. of coal." That shows of course that what was given could really effect no good purpose.

4122. Earl of Aberdeen.] How was the information obtained?
This information is obtained from the visitors and from the applicants, and tested by other references.

4123. But how was it ascertained which recipients were unworthy and which were worthy?
That was the result of inquiry in each case.

4124. Lord Balfour of Burley.] The people who were giving the tickets had not made the proper inquiry, but you, for the purpose of finding out what was going on, found out these individuals getting relief in this way, and you made inquiries as to the circumstances and habits of the people for yourselves?
In all these cases reference was made to us to assist if possible. Probably, in all these cases reference was made to the parish, and we asked them what they were doing; and that is how these facts came to light. They had already been assisted by them before the cases came to us; and I quote them simply to show what was going on in the ordinary way in voluntary relief when care was not taken in the investigation and so on.

4125. Earl of Aberdeen.] When you speak of parochial charity, you do not mean relief given by the Poor Law?
No; by the ecclesiastical district. I might mention that here, one or two cases of out-relief turn up which might interest you. The general result from looking at these cases was that the Poor Law administration was good; I must say
say that; but in some instances the inadequacy of the relief was striking. Here
is one: An old woman, who can earn 2 s. 6 d. and pays 2 s. 6 d. for rent, has
3 s. out relief. Another old woman has 3 s. 6 d. out relief, which, eeked out by
2 s. from the Church, keeps her alive. In one case, an old woman had 3 s. 6 d.,
whose three sons seemed in a position to assist her. Those are just chance
instances, but they show, it seems to me, that the whole method of what one may
call allowance relief is a difficult method. If you deal with a case from the
point of view of doing something definite with it, you have to brace yourself up
to an effort, and demand some sort of an effort from the person you are assisting.
On the other hand, a system of allowances is very difficult to supervise: you
cannot tell, without very great difficulty, what is coming in from other sources,
and you must have a supervision like that at Elberfeld, which is elaborated to a
high degree, to check the various sources of income.

4126. Chairman.] You speak of an "effort," but in the case of an old woman
who may be infirm, effort may be impossible?
I admit the exception. In that case, adequate relief should be given; it is
obvious; but, if it is a good case, I mean a case in which there has been thrift,
and which ought not distinctly to fall upon the Poor Law, charitable means we
think ought to be forthcoming to aid. In other instances, of course, what one
fears is an insufficient allowance outside.

4127. But taking such cases as the one you just now mentioned of an
old and infirm woman who can earn 2 s. 6 d. a week, and who is given an
allowance in order to enable her to live outside the workhouse, in your opinion
is it desirable that that case should be dealt with by out relief, or should that
woman be offered relief in the workhouse?
It would be impossible to tell without going into other facts, as to the posi-
tions of the relations, and so on. If the person has been thrifty and saving
and so forth, I think it would be better that the case were taken up by charity.
If, on the other hand, there is nothing of that sort to record, then it seems to
me that it would be better that it should be left to the Poor Law. The difficulty of
supplementation of the earnings by the Poor Law is, that it, as it seems to me,
affects the earnings of all similar old women, and to do for the immediate good
of one what is possibly, as it would seem, a very great injury to a larger
number.

4128. But suppose a case where a woman earned nothing, but her relatives
provided, for example, the rent, say 2 s. 6 d., would you be of opinion that in
that case out-door relief might properly be given; or would you again there
prefer that the workhouse should be offered?
In that case, if relations would help, I think charity should help.

4129. But supposing that there was no charity forthcoming which could be
depended upon, in what way do you think the guardians ought to deal with a
case of that kind?
I think it would be better that there was no out-door relief.

4130. I think that besides your investigation in Marylebone, you made an
investigation in Southwark at about the same time?
Yes.

4131. And was the result the same?
Yes. I could give instances like those that were in Marylebone; very
similar.

4132. I have no doubt that your society interested itself in the distribution
of the Mansion House Fund?
Yes.

4133. Could you tell us what the result of your inquiries as to the effect of
that Fund was?
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We went into the matter very carefully at the time, and we came to the conclusion that such a central fund as that, with such an administration of charity as is available in London at the present time, could hardly be anything but very injurious; in fact, we know that it incited many persons to come for relief; it stimulated applications. The rush of applicants for relief was something terrible almost at certain centres. It was impossible to follow any definite rules for a day or two in the middle of this rush; and people were alarmed, and they gave money anyhow; and, as I said, also the people were tempted away from work to come for the relief. Of course, a second year of that, and a third year, and we should have had something very like a very deleterious charity out relief system.

4134. Do you think that there was on that occasion exceptional distress which required to be specially dealt with in the metropolis?

Yes; I think that there was distress.

4135. And how would you have dealt with it?

Locally, in the first instance, and quietly, and as far as possible by getting persons who wished to help to allow you to refer to them if money was wanted, and to draw upon their time if their time was wanted. The more quietly these things are done, I think, the better.

4136. And probably you would agree that the smaller the area of work, the more likely that there would be a careful and patient inquiry into particular cases?

Certainly; for ordinary relief purposes the parochial areas of London are none too small.

4137. It may be almost certainly concluded, may it not, that an attempt to relieve, from a special fund, distress all over the metropolis, would be certain to lead to mismanagement and failure?

Yes, I think so. That was the previous experience of 1862–63, and I believe it has always been so.

4138. Have you ever had this objection raised to the system of dealing with a considerable number of cases which might otherwise be referred to the guardians by means of charity, that you are in that way relieving the ratepayers generally from a burden which they ought to bear, and casting it upon a certain section only of the ratepayers who are of a charitable disposition?

Yes, I have heard that, but at the same time I do not think there is ground for it. As a matter of fact, as soon as there is good administration on both sides, on the part of charity, and on the part of the Poor Law, a large number of persons who would otherwise apply for relief on both sides do not apply. As an instance, the Birmingham Board, for example, have a cross visitor, as they call him; he checks the work of the other relieving officers, and he comes suddenly upon all classes of out relief cases. That immediately shows that a certain number are unsuitable for relief altogether. Then as to those cases which charity does take up they are, par excellence, cases which no one who cares about these things would wish to leave unassisted; and therefore we are not doing what the Poor Law would do; we are doing what charity should do. And then again one would be very loath to have a charity system of out-door relief; what we want is to make people independent of both kinds of relief; and therefore if the charitable people will themselves work towards thrift in their dealing with the cases, the chances are that they may win away a great many people, especially the younger generation, from being dependent on relief.

4139. Supposing there were a complete and regular organisation of charity and co-operation with the administration of the Poor Law by the guardians, might it not be argued that there would be some danger that the charitable organisation would be, in fact, an organisation for distributing out-door relief on a large scale?

There
There is distinctly that danger; unless there is training, a distinct recognition of principle, and a good supervision, there is always a danger lest charity should revert to a system of unsteady charity.

4140. A system of doles?
Yes. On the other hand, no doubt the Poor Law would have quite enough for its funds if the guardians acted upon the permissive powers they have in regard to special classes of cases; those I have referred to, the weak-minded, deformed, and so on; and in that way, by dealing with the individual case rather than the mass, I think that they would be taking a new part in the administration of relief, and charity would be taking a new part too.

4141. You probably would not differ from me in thinking that the best kind of charitable relief is that which proceeds from individuals who are well acquainted with the case, and which is given where they have ascertained that it is likely to produce a good effect?
Certainly.

4142. And you would also, I daresay, agree with me that it is far better, where it can be done, that organised societies should rather direct the charity of individuals to deserving cases, than be themselves the administrators of funds collected from other people?
Certainly; we ought to be the supplementers of individual workers, and so far as the work of any charity is good it ought to be done on the individual plan.

4143. Every effort ought to be made to encourage individual workers and to discourage the administration of funds on a large scale by societies which never can be so well acquainted as individuals with honest worth in the particular cases?
Yes. If the workers will go to those who can tell them about the case, if they will learn how the poor live (a very difficult thing to do), then it seems to me that they have in their hands a charity of greater efficacy than anybody else. The more private it is the better.

4144. I suppose that if most people dealt with every case individually known to them, probably, if such a state of things could be imagined, the difficulty would be at an end?
Yes, it would be very different from what it is.

4145. If we were to have anything like an official organisation of charity, would you not fear that in this country it would tend to dry up charity to a certain extent?
Yes, I should; and for my part I should much rather that it was left voluntary, except possibly so far as this is concerned: I think it would be very useful for the charities to have some centre of registration where they could, on the same method as the friendly societies register, send in their reports and accounts. I think that as the influence of these charities on the community for good or evil is so large, it is a fair thing to ask them to do so much as this on their part. I should, of course, omit the voluntary parochial charities, but the very large institutions that there are for all purposes, ought, I think, to have some sort of official centre, not by way of control so much as by way of information.

4146. Have you considered the operation of the medical charities of London; of the large hospitals?
Yes, we have had several inquiries at different times in regard to them. The points that we have paid most attention to are these: Whether any large proportion of the people who attend these hospitals could provide for themselves, and in that case probably pay their way at provident dispensaries; whether, on the other hand, there are a certain number who would be properly applicants for Poor Law medical relief. In 1875 we had an inquiry about the 641 out-patients at the Royal Free Hospital, and it was ascertained that 12 could pay a private practitioner; 231 could afford to subscribe to a provident dispensary; 169 were proper applicants for a free hospital; 57 were (70.)
Poor Law cases; 103 gave false addresses; and about 69 sufficient information could not be obtained. And then in 1875-6 we had also the investigation of cases at the Great Ormond-street Children's Hospital for a considerable period. They referred to us a large number. Tickets were given them by the authorities; and the applicants were not treated on a second visit to the hospital, unless their tickets were stamped by a charity organisation committee. The tickets were not stamped if the wages of the applicant were over 30 sh., or if they were in receipt of parish relief; or if they declined to give information, or gave wrong addresses. If they were apparently not able to pay their way, their letters were stamped. Of 8,798 cases, 4,574 which were referred to the Society were received, that is to say, only 51 per cent. of them came. Of these 4,574, the letters of 786 were either not stamped or not called for. There was thus a further deduction of 786 from the total; leaving as the number which would be permanent out-patients 3,788, or 43 per cent. of the total.

4147. What do you mean by “not able to pay their way”? By that I mean, were proper applicants to a free hospital.

4148. Persons who could not have provided themselves out of their own funds with medical relief?

Yes. Similar inquiries have been made at Manchester and elsewhere, and there has been always found to be, wherever there is a free and open out-patient department, a certain proportion, sometimes a considerable proportion, of both those classes: those that should pay and those that might very fairly go to a parish dispensary.

4149. Speaking generally, the existence of these very large facilities in connection with the hospitals in London, tends, does it not, to discourage the poor of London from providing medical assistance for themselves?

Certainly. I think there is no question of that.

4150. In a marked degree?

In a marked degree. The provident dispensaries, for instance, generally speaking, get on best in the suburbs, that is, at a distance from the hospitals.

4151. Can you suggest any remedy for this evil?

I think, myself, that we ought to have a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the whole matter. It is an enormous business. We have lately had a huge development of these poor-law infirmaries. Since the Act of 1867, the Metropolitan Poor Act, they have been enlarged, and are conducted on very good plans and principles, and the buildings are very fine. That is a new factor in the administration of relief in London. And then, again, there are all the difficulties as to the special hospitals, which are continually created, and there is such a competition, so to speak, for the patient, one way and another, now, that a man has every inducement to go to an hospital if there is anything the matter with him at all. On the other hand, there are the wants of the medical profession; they must be met; they must have their cases for purposes of instruction. Therefore some balance of interests must, I think, be arrived at between the different parties concerned, and I do not see how that can come about without a consideration of the wants of the different parts of London geographically, and all of the new conditions which has been introduced into the problem by the infirmaries. I doubt whether anything short of an inquiry like that could deal with it satisfactorily; it wants special study, and evidence from all parties interested. Then again, on the other hand, the hospitals themselves are very much pressed for want of money.

4152. The problem seems to be to prevent those persons who are able to provide medical relief for themselves from taking advantage of the hospitals at the expense of the charitable persons who support them?

Yes.

4153. And you would be of opinion, perhaps, that if such a restriction upon the number getting gratuitous medical relief could be in any way enforced, the whole difficulty as to the want of funds for the hospitals would disappear?

Yes;
Yes; I think it is very likely it would. But there are two things that might be done. I think that the system of supporting the hospitals well, as they are supported in the North, through the contributions of the working classes, should be developed; that is one source of income there.

4154. Earl of Onslow.] Can you explain a little more the plan adopted in the North?

They arrange specially for it. The secretary of the hospital there would go to a workshop and tell the men about the hospital, and get their contributions. Then, again, I cannot see why those who are interested in individual cases should not pay the cost of the cases at the hospitals; the hospitals are doing charitable work for the individual. Thus we pay at present to convalescent homes most of the cost of the patients we send. The more that is done, the more the hospital has a certain fixed income. I do not think it is fair upon institutions which are very large, and very important to the community, that they should be so subject to changes of public opinion or to anything that may occur in a difficult year. Then I should work positively at the hospitals in this way. I think that it is not enough to say that the people shall not have relief, but I think that it might be very possible to work at the hospital on the provident principle: either referring people to provident dispensaries or doing what they are now at the Metropolitan Hospital, that is to say, having a local provident department.

4155. Chairman.] By a provident department, you mean a department where medical relief is given at a fixed sum?

Yes, on a fixed weekly payment.

4156. But a fixed weekly payment will entitle the payer to medical relief in the hospital if he requires it?

Yes, and then those that attend there can be admitted inside the hospital if their diseases make it necessary.

4157. I should like to ask you, with reference to the casual poor and casual wards, whether you have any suggestions to make on that subject?

The line, generally speaking, which I should be inclined to press is this: It seems to me that, with better charitable administration, it would be possible to co-operate much more closely with the casual wards. The refuges, on the other hand, might very fairly take the exceptional cases. The casual wards, generally speaking, are set along the main London roads, and there are several of them in the centre of London, very rightly and well. The refuges, on the other hand, are comparatively few and are placed mostly in the centre part, a line running, say, from Westminster, where the old Newport Market Refuge now is, down to the new shelter at Stepney. Their accommodation is comparatively small, whereas the casual ward accommodation is comparatively large, and is hardly ever used entirely. If we used the refuges for exceptional cases, we ought to have thoroughly good, decent accommodation for them, better than, or at any rate quite as good as that at the casual ward; and there ought to be always, if possible, a sifting of cases there with a view to ultimate treatment.

4158. By refuges you mean charitable casual wards?

Yes; I am drawing a distinction between refuges and casual wards. I have here these casual wards and refuges set out on a map. Of course any destitute person can apply to the relieving officer or the workhouse; and so there are endless centres to which these houseless persons, if they are taken with strong necessity, should apply; and therefore the Poor Law provision seems to me very fairly complete. But it is a question whether there is to be or should be any kind of alternative to a casual ward, and personally I should be anxious that, from voluntary resources only, an experiment should be made for trying to deal with the pick of casual ward cases by training on land on a system like that in Germany; but I should not put it at all upon the rates; I think the experiment should be entirely voluntary at this stage.
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4159. Do you find that the guardians co-operate heartily with the managers of refuges?
I doubt whether there is at all good co-operation.

4160. Is it not very desirable that there should be a full co-operation as regards casual paupers, so that those who do not belong to the vagrant class could be sent to the refuges?
Certainly, most desirable: and there ought to be a conference on that subject before the winter, if possible.

4161. The administration of casual wards must always be, if I may use the term, severe, must it not, owing to the nature of the vagrant class?
Certainly.

4162. But the very severity of that discipline makes them operate hardly with regard to persons who are homeless, and do not belong to the regular vagrant class; and in order to deal with those cases you would strongly advocate co-operation between the guardians and the refuges, so that certain cases might be sent to the refuges, and the persons going there might be, if possible, assisted to obtain a living?
Yes; all along the fine between charity and the poor law there ought to be that kind of co-operation.

4163. I gathered from a remark you made just now, that you would be in favour of some system like what is known as the Dutch labour colonies; did I rightly gather that from you?
No; I should not be in favour of the Dutch system, which I think, myself, is a failure. As a system of reformatory work, it has distinctly failed; the number of those who come back again and again is large. From the point of view of a colony, a voluntary colony, it is not a self-supporting colony; they have not all their vacancies filled at present, and they have no method, it appears to me, of training men and passing them out into the world to be self-dependent. They take on an average at present only five new cases in a year. A system like that is not worth adopting, it seems to me. The men in the voluntary colonies are respectable self-supporting men; it answers for the small numbers that go there; but it is a large cost for that end, and I am sure, from my point of view that it would not be worth while adopting it. The German system is a different one. There they deal quickly, comparatively, with a larger number of men; they say something like 7 or 8 per cent. are ultimately helped, but they say that under any circumstances it is better than a purely detention system. The German system is a purely voluntary one, and the only money they can get from the State are certain grants from the Kreis or circle, or some other authority, to start the concern.

4164. And do you recommend that such colonies should be established in this country?
I should not myself recommend that, except so far; I think a small experiment with reference to the vagrant class, on voluntary lines, watched carefully for a year, under very good hands, would be worth making.

4165. What would be the nature of your experiment?
I think that if any land that could be had cheap was used, the men might be drafted by pick from casual wards to the care of a thoroughly competent manager, and they might be looked after, and as far as possible detained, and as far as possible reformed, made business-like and punctual and strengthened, for, say, three months or so. I think that that is worth trying.

4166. Would you give a power of compulsory detention?
No, I should not myself; I should try it on a purely voluntary plan, and try it purely experimentally; but I think it is worth trying in that humble manner. The problem you see of dealing with the casual is so very difficult. You apply detention and strong remedies to a certain point; naturally he stays away, but he may roam the country all the same. On the other hand, if you have a lax system, he comes in, as he would into an "associated" ward where he can talk to other
other people, and he is in no way bettered by the plan at all; and I, for my part, would not use the Poor Law, at any rate in the case of adults, as a reformatory system. I think that that is far better done with all the difficulties underlying the question, by voluntary means.

4167. In mentioning the different charities in London, I do not think you referred to the special charities for distributing food; have you anything to say on that subject?

We made an inquiry about that class of charity in January and February 1887. Those charities are very numerous, and during the winter particularly, a very great deal of relief is given in that way. We had a return made, and as far as we could learn (we took a great deal of trouble to collect the information), for three or four days of the week during the winter some 64,000 free, or in some cases part paid, meals are given to children and adults. It is really a very large section of charity now, and to a certain extent it has revived in connection with School Board work; but a great part of the meals given in connection with the School Board are given on the part payment system. This cannot, I think, be made self-supporting; not absolutely. I think, judging from a certain number of cases which I myself inquired into, that in many instances where this sort of relief is given, the people want different handling altogether. There may be some definite cause for their distress, and that is not touched; and if we had more individual work and more care in the individual case, I think that a good many of these cases which get free meals could be dealt with in another way, and effectively. Of course in the lack of people to help this wholesale system has a sort of justification that I allow; but on the other hand, it ought not to be considered as final in any way.

4168. I think you said that the giving of meals to children had been found to be one impossible to work on the basis of self-support?

Yes. I think unless you really exclude a good many of the smaller items, such as rent of room and so on, it is quite impossible.

4169. Is it a useful form of charity?

I should avoid it myself. I should rather, if I had the work to do, try all I could with individual cases, and try and get people who could influence the parent, at work in an endeavour to do so.

4170. In the case of thoroughly vicious parents who have no care for their children, in what way are the children to be so fed as to be fit to undertake their school course?

I think the thoroughly vicious, and those who care for their children not at all, are after all a minority; and even so, supposing it is a case of absolute drink on the part of both parents, which is an extreme case, I am not quite sure whether we ought not to be prepared to legislate so as to be enabled to deal with them properly; but under any circumstances I would rather make a real attempt to deal with the children at home than bring them to some central place to be fed. My strong feeling is that the habits of being fed leads to the habit of thought under which persons conceive that they are likely, as they grow up, and their children also, to be similarly treated. It is not that we ask people to do less; we ask them to do more in this matter.

4171. Have you found that many of the poor of London are in benefit clubs?

The proportion is far less than it should be, I think. Here is a note with regard to those cases I referred to just now at St. Saviour's, and at Marylebone: At St. Saviour's out of 500 applicants 42 only belonged to clubs, and 10, 8, and six out of the 42 belonged to the Foresters, Oddfellows, and Hearts of Oak respectively; 34 persons were insured, almost entirely in the industrial insurance societies; that is to say for burial purposes; only seven belong to trade societies. Then in Marylebone, out of the 500 cases, 49 belonged to clubs, and 15 of these to slate clubs, that is to say clubs which divide at the end of the year; 12, 3, and 4 belonged to the Foresters, Odd Fellows, and Hearts of Oak respectively (I mention those three because those are the stronger societies), and only five belonged to trade societies.
4172. Do you think that the proportion is smaller in London than in any other large town?

I think so: I think there is hardly a question of that; the Royal Commission on Friendly Societies stated distinctly that south of the Trent there was less care about these things.

4173. To what cause do you attribute that?

Partly to the odd job labour of which there is so much in London: partly, I think, to the large number of speculative chances of relief and jobs also, which there are in London; and partly, also, because I think that the people who might look after them, as employers, or as visitors, or whatever it may be, have not at all laid the stress upon this side of the work which they ought to do. I think that the whole question of thrift in reference to influencing your neighbour has been more or less overlooked, at any rate in regard to the charitable work of London.

4174. Returning to a question I asked you before, I should like to ask whether you are in favour of relief works in cases of extraordinary distress.

I should not say that I was not, in a very extreme case; but on the whole, I think that the relief works are very undesirable. I think that the experience of the Committee which was appointed last winter, in connection with the Mansion House, to take up cases which had been employed during the winter, was very unsatisfactory. We found that we could deal with a very small per centage of the cases; and a good many of the people were not people to draw into relief works, I think. And the worst of these relief works is that after they are over, the family are just where they were; they get the employment for the winter, a few months, and then, unless they have it next winter and the winter after, they remain in the same position; but on the other hand, one has done this injury, drawn a large number of comparatively young men on to a relief system. Now those men ought not to want to come, we ought to do our best to keep them from coming; but it was quite startling how many of them were quite young men; they did not belong to trade societies; they were labourers living in a happy-go-lucky sort of way, and sometimes they were married, and had young children, and sometimes they had not a strong physique.

4175. Do you apply your observations to such relief works as are undertaken by vestries, being works which they require for other reasons, and not merely undertaken for the purposes of relief, but upon which they employ those who are out of work and are living in the particular parish, in preference to putting work out to contract in the ordinary manner.

I think that we may have growing up a system of practically continuous relief works in connection with the parishes if we are not careful. If the parish wants to make its contract at this or that time, or to have this bit of work done at this or that time, and it is a matter of indifference, by all means let them do what they think is best as the trustees of the community for the common good; but if they are pressed by a sort of demand, and therefore do it under the guise of practical charity, I think it is a pity; I think it would be a mistake to encourage that at all. The more the people can get to understand that they must live by their own means and that they must provide against the winter, the better; in fact, unless they do that, we must increase the amount of relief as the population grows. That is the alternative. So that if it is in any way a disguised form of relief, I should say it did not touch the heart of the question, and we had better not do it; it would be better, far, for us to, if need be, reorganise our system of charity so as to get the visitors and the members of friendly societies to draw them into the societies.

4176. There would be this danger, that the relief works would come to be regarded as part of the regular system of relief in winter?

No doubt.

4177. And that being so, you would always have an abundant supply of persons seeking such work?

Yes.

4178. And
4178. And the tendency, probably, would be for the number of persons to increase?
Yes.

4179. And the result would be that as there are unfortunately a great number of people who live now in what you call a happy-go-lucky way, when they found that they were sure in the winter of these relief works, they would calculate upon it as a matter of course?
Yes; I may mention that while seeing these men this last winter, in several instances they said to me, "Well, we have been at the works; we could not get other work." Now facilities were given to those at the works, if they wanted to do so, to go elsewhere in search of work; but in spite of that they had been content to receive the smaller wage at the works instead of going out and looking for work themselves even at a time of year when they ought to have been at work again.

4180. That is easily explicable, is it not, by the not unnatural desire of everyone to get what they want with as little trouble as possible?
Certainly.

4181. Have you any suggestion to make as to the qualification of guardians?
I cannot help thinking that it would be a great advantage if the local qualification could be dispensed with to a certain extent. I mean that there should be a qualification, but available in any part of the metropolis; in any case, for nominated guardians. I think there are many people who would be very useful guardians, and do a great deal to improve the administration, persons of leisure and ability, who can hardly purchase or occupy a house in order to qualify. I think they would bond fide become thoroughly interested in the district, and be on every ground suitable; but at present they cannot serve. It is a question whether there should be this change in regard to elected guardians; but, on the whole, I am inclined to think that the local people would have so great an advantage that it is not to be feared even in that case; but it would be prudent to limit it to nominated guardians.

4182. Is there any other point on which you desire to give evidence?
I think there is one point in connection with the administration abroad that is worth considering, and that is their plan of co-opting outsiders in regard to certain branches of work; it is a sort of nomination; but these men come in as experts, and they keep up a closer connection with some department of work such as, for instance, boarding out; I think that that system of co-option abroad of what they call their select citizens is very good.

4183. Earl of Aberdeen.] In connection with voluntary refuges, I think you mentioned, did you not, that you would be in favour of uniting such a system with some industrial resources, connected with land or otherwise?
I should not connect it at all with land, except in this way: that any suitable case out of a refuge might be sent to any plot which was used for the purpose of ascertaining by experiment whether any better system of dealing with homeless cases could be devised.

4184. How would you meet the objection, often raised to any such experiment, that it would interfere with the local labour market?
I do not think it need do that if the system is adopted of employing the people fairly on work which would otherwise not be done. It would interfere to a certain extent, I allow; but it is simply a question of choice of difficulties, and I think, on the whole, the experiment is worth trying.

4185. The need is very great, and you think that it would justify, at least, an experiment, and then we should be able to judge whether the advantages counterbalance the apparent drawbacks.
I want to understand what you mean by "the need." The need that I think would justify it is this; that there are a great many vagrants now in England, and any reasonable plan that can test the question whether the vagrant can be brought out of his vagrancy is worth trying.

(70.)
4186. With regard to meals given to children, have you made, or has there been made, any calculation or estimate of the number of children who habitually are sent to Board schools without breakfast?

I believe there have been estimates made, but I could not mention them, and I do not think that any estimate has been made which, so far as I know, would hold water.

4187. You would be in favour, as I understand you, not of any general or extended system of providing food for such children, but of endeavouring to influence the parents or relatives at home?

Certainly.

4188. Then meanwhile what is to become of these children who are in a condition which is fatal to their progress?

Meanwhile we are neglecting our opportunity of dealing with them through their parents; we are not trying to deal with the question from the only point from which it can be effectually dealt with; so I do not think we can quite allow ourselves the argument "meanwhile."

4189. But while we may hope that the rising generation will be very different from those who are now parents, must not the process be very gradual as regards such improvements; and, therefore is it not right that a direct effort should be made for the children?

The question is, whether you would move upwards or downwards on those lines. My impression is that the progress would be downwards.

4190. If we suppose a case well suited for charity, but about which inquiry has not already been made, what steps ought to be adopted, or what steps do you adopt in connection with your society, for ascertaining whether the case is deserving?

The steps would be these; in an ordinary instance, the person requiring help would call at one of our offices, and he would then be asked various questions as to where he lived, and how long he had been at his present address, and what his family was, what they earned, what he had saved, how he was supporting himself, how he could be permanently benefited.

4191. These are all questions which would be put to the applicant?

To the applicant.

4192. I was rather alluding to a complaint which has been frequently made, and, of course, brought under your notice, that inquiries have to be made, or are made as to the individuals who apply for relief, of their neighbours, the local tradesmen, and so forth, which have a damaging effect upon such persons?

The rule is that inquiries should be made of those whom they themselves mention. I do not say that in no cases is inquiry made of a neighbour; but still it would be distinctly an exception.

4193. You would agree that it is very desirable that those who are appointed to investigate the cases should be persons not only imbued with the desire to detect imposture, but also with a certain amount of the spirit of humanity and kindness to avoid unnecessary asperities in their investigation?

Most certainly. Unless it can be done primarily upon a charitable basis, and in a charitable spirit, I do not think that work can be done at all.

4194. You endeavour to obtain officials who are imbued with that spirit?

Yes; and also volunteers are working side by side with them in every well-managed office, and they will very often do parts of the inquiries themselves in certain districts.

4195. Going to another point, you alluded to what is called a cross visitor in Birmingham?

Yes.

4196. Is the operation of such an official to produce uniformity of administration in the Poor Law?

I should imagine so.

4197. Have
4107. Have you had occasion to notice the drawback and mischief caused by a want of uniformity in London in that matter?

I think so.

4108. Can you suggest any special method in which improvement might be attempted?

I think that when a board has tried a plan, such, for instance, as has prevailed at Whitechapel for a considerable time, it might be allowed to fix it as a continuing plan by bye-law or otherwise; and I think that if that were done, by degrees it would be adopted elsewhere, and so the system would spread. At present the chances of change are very great; and I think that the poor appreciate uniformity as much as any one; if they know what they can expect, they arrange accordingly.

4109. You mentioned here to-day, and also on a former occasion elsewhere, your opinion as to the great importance of aiming at the development of habits of thrift among the poor?

Yes.

4200. In such instances as the distress among the dock labourers, which is very real I apprehend, would it not be rather a mockery to preach providence and thrift to people who are fighting for work at the dock gates?

There again it is so difficult to generalise. As a matter of fact, one finds very often that the small wage-earner has the most comfortable home; you will find comfortable and uncomfortable homes in the worst parts; and so much depends upon the wife. So that I think that everything turns upon one's getting to know the details. And then I think there are many cases in which, speaking generally, one is inclined to say that they cannot save, but you find that with a little care they could do so.

4201. I am entirely with you in the importance of this object; and your last answer suggests what I was going to ask; what method could be adopted in carrying out this object.

I think the system of having boys' lodges, such as those attached to the Foresters. It seems to me that every child who leaves school might very fairly join one of those lodges, and I think that no work could be better than that those who have charge of the children at the school should do their utmost to get such lodges established. Then they would begin at, I think it is, nine or ten with very small payments, and be drafted eventually into the large body of the society.

4202. Earl Spencer. As a matter of fact, are there boys' lodges attached to all these provident societies?

No, unfortunately not. There is an increase of them. It has been tried successfully, I think, at the Princess Royal Boy Foresters' Lodge at Stepney; that is one, and I think there are others now; but enough has not yet been done; the work wants doing.

4203. Earl of Aberdeen. As to the hospitals; is it your opinion that the immense development of the Poor Law hospitals improvement, extension, and so forth, is in itself a sufficient reason why the existing system of free hospitals and out-patient treatment should be entirely revised?

Perhaps I should say No, if one did not know that there are many Poor Law cases in attendance at hospitals; but these two things taken together make me think that it is a sufficient reason.

4204. Taking also into consideration the important field for medical science which is afforded by these Poor Law infirmaries, and which are not yet fully, or much utilized in that respect?

Yes; but one must remember, I think, that if you introduce the medical men into the infirmaries, you may get a state of things in which they will wish to keep the person, on medical grounds, in the infirmary. At present, at any rate, there is no secondary inducement of that sort at work; and, therefore, if that is done it will require very close supervision.

(70.)
4205. At any rate, you think that there is great room for reform in the present administration of the public free hospitals?

Yes; I think the system taken together wants combining, and strengthening, and reorganisation.

4206. Earl of Strafford. Do you think that a Royal Commission would do good, if one were appointed to inquire into the administration of the funds, and the working of the different hospitals and dispensaries.

Very much good; it would make a complete statement possible.

4207. With your knowledge of London, which must be considerable, do you know Kilburn well?

No, I do not.

4208. Do you know what is called, I think, the Kilburn Mission, where there are two ladies, Miss Ayckbourne and Miss Thomas, who, during the winter and any time of great distress, provide dinners for women and children, and, as far as they can, work for the men in different parts of London; have you heard of that?

Yes, from time to time. I should say that they were rather a pauperising body.

4209. In what way?

They give free dinners, and I saw the other day an appeal for a Refuge which they are starting. I think that it shows the sort of way they are at work, and it seems to me to tend to creating applicants. This is a sort of religious appeal, and I can only quote that part which refers to the particular question. This is extracted from their paper; it is on behalf of the Cooper's Row Refuge: "Will you who read share with us the blessing of caring for those who are homeless... and help us to keep this home permanently open for the poorest and most-to-be-pitied of the poor, those dependent entirely on charity? We shall be very thankful for any sums, large or small, for our Night Refuge?" Then, there is a nota bene at the bottom: "We may mention here that we have housed and fed over 1,400 men since we opened our little Refuge last December." Then there is a special appeal to the rich. But I cannot help thinking that this is either doing the work of the Poor Law, or doing very imperfect charity.

4210. And you think that that relief is given without due inquiry on the part of the donors as to the recipients being worthy persons?

More than that; I think that if you are dealing with people on this plea only, and give them an asylum and food, you put yourself in the position, if you do inquire, of inquiring about many things, in order to do very little for them, and you also put yourself in the position of making it impossible to deal thoroughly with so many cases, if you wish to inquire. So that this organisation of people at a central relief depot in this manner, seems to me to defeat the ends of charity.

4211. I suppose you would not go to quite the extent of finding an objection to the women and children working in the sort of temporary shelter that they have there during the winter; your objection would not apply to them so much as to the giving the out-door relief in the shape of doles to the able-bodied men who come there?

You see, the people who are employed there in that way are probably employed at very low wages, and it is a question whether you are not doing more harm to the community than good to the individual by it. And then, as to the individual, I always ask, "What are you really doing for the individual?" The difficulty of dealing with this class of case is that the poor are relieved in the winter, and simply elbowed through the summer.

4212. You think it is almost impossible for these ladies to follow up the cases, and see that they work during the summer, and make some sort of provision for the winter?

Unless they are working with very many other people, and on a very careful local system; and I have no reason to believe that there are any such means available to them.

4213. Have
4213. Have you ever heard of what is called the Amateur Casual Ward in the East End of London, in Commercial-road, established by Mr. Harold Bolton about two years ago?

Yes.

4214. What is your opinion of that?

It is not good enough, I think, for a refuge in its arrangements, and it is too much like a casual ward.

4215. Do you think that it has done harm or good?

I really cannot answer a general question like that. I can only judge from their reports, and so forth, and for our part (and we have said the same to them), we do not think that it meets the conditions of a refuge, and, therefore, we cannot, so far as we know of it, approve of it.

4216. Was it during the winter before last?

The winter before last and last winter.

4217. Earl of Milltown.] In answer to a case put to you by the noble Earl in the Chair, of an old woman who is receiving a certain amount of relief from her family, which enabled her to pay her rent, but did not give her enough to live upon, you said that in such a case if charity should not be forthcoming, it would not be desirable to administer out-door relief; may I ask you your grounds for that opinion?

In reference to that case it seems to me that the difficulties of administering out-door relief are so great that it would be inadvisable to give these people out-door relief; and if it is a good case, I think that by the refusal of the community, qua Poor Law guardians, to deal with it, the charitable people will be stirred to their duty. At present you may say that there is not charitable relief forthcoming; but, of course, as long as the system goes on, there is less likelihood of there being such relief.

4218. Then you would refuse the out-relief in the hope that such a somewhat stern administration of the law might excite charity; that is practically what it comes to?

I think that is the tendency.

4219. Are you in favour, under any circumstances, of giving out-door relief?

That is a hard question. I think that one is very strongly in favour of a limitation, of a continuous limitation. I am not a guardian, and perhaps I could not answer that question fairly; otherwise, I think that there is a great deal of out-door relief given that is quite unnecessary.

4220. At first sight it strikes one, does it not, that such a case as that, if out-door relief is to be given at all, would be one that would call for it?

Yes, and I think that we should aim at not giving it at all?

4221. You advocate some machinery by which the working classes should be urged or called upon to contribute more freely than they do now to the support of the hospitals?

Yes.

4222. Is it with the object of getting further funds for the hospitals or with the object of excluding from the hospitals all except those who are legitimately entitled to apply?

No, I had not the last object in my mind when I spoke; I was speaking of it purely from the point of view of the deficit of the hospital funds.

4223. You did mention the two together?

I did mention the two together.

4224. Are you in favour of the class of casuals being retained. It has been suggested to us by several witnesses that it would be well to do away with the distinction of casuals altogether, and to assimilate them to other persons in the workhouses; what is you view on that.

(70.)
I think it is entirely a question of administration. The casual ward, as I understand it, has grown up by being a sort of disconnected room of the workhouse; and it may be so inconvenient to have these persons in the workhouse that it is well to have the casual ward. But on the other hand, the more the casual can be dealt with as a resident and an ordinary pauper, I should say, the better; but that would be on general grounds. It seems to me a question of administration.

4225. You think it is necessary, for the present at any rate, to maintain the casual ward?

I doubt whether we could make any sudden change.

4226. With regard to the election of guardians, you are in favour, under certain circumstances, of doing away with the qualification; do you think it would be desirable that the election should be triennial, instead of annual, one-third retiring each year?

I could wish only that the qualification should be metropolitan instead of local. With regard to a triennial election, I think the question turns upon this, whether as a matter of fact there are very great changes in the course of the annual elections. I do not see, if the same people really are elected year after year, with the chance that one or two may drop out, that the question is very important. If, on the other hand, it is the only condition under which you can get a steady Board acting upon a consistent policy, then I think the change should be made. I have not myself seen any returns which deal with that point, which seems to me the crucial one.

4227. One of the witnesses stated to us a case of a whole board having been turned out on a purely political question. Supposing such an occurrence as that, then you would be in favour of such a system as I have suggested to you?

Yes. I cannot help thinking that the system of a certain number retiring every year, which is now adopted in several departments of administration, is the more suitable.

4228. Lord Balfour of Burley.] With regard to this institution at Kilburn, have representations been made to your society that since its operations commenced, whole streets have been deserted by respectable working class people, and occupied by those who are practically the beneficiaries of that charity?

Yes; statements in that direction have been made. As I am referring to a particular institution, I should rather give the actual words with exactness than answer a general question. I could easily arrange that you should be provided with any information that we have.

4229. Chairman.] Would you send someone to put in the information that you have?

Yes.

4230. Lord Thring.] With respect to the hospitals, I agree with you that part payment ought to be made; but are you aware that the hospitals really and truly make no arrangements, as a general rule, for part payment at all?

Yes.

4231. In fact, that they rather discourage it?

Some are now encouraging it; still it is not a system, generally speaking.

4232. I wished to bring that out, because I think it is a great defect in the hospitals that they make no arrangement for part payment; so much so, that the other day when I wanted to pay for a particular person, for reasons which it is not necessary to state, they rather discouraged it. I wished to bring that out.

That is certainly so.

4233. I greatly
4233. I greatly admire your organisation; but supposing I want to set it on foot in any particular district, I want to know how I am to do it:
   In London, do you mean?

4234. Or in the country; in both, I should like to know?
   The first thing to do, it seems to me, is to find what desire there is on the part of residents to co-operate in their relief work.

4235. To form a committee, in fact?
   Yes, to form a committee.

4236. Would you endeavour to get the clergy visiting committees, or an independent committee?
   A committee formed out of all the people on the spot, as far as they will combine.

4237. To visit the poor?
   They must have some sort of central office for their work, and there they must have an index of cases, and so on, to prevent overlapping, and they must have probably either an honorary secretary who gives all his time nearly to it, or some paid officer and a great deal of honorary help.

4238. They must have an office to begin with?
   Yes.

4239. They must have a caretaker, at all events, or what would be better, a secretary, a paid officer?
   Yes; probably the paid officer would be what we should call an agent in a district such as you refer to.

4240. What sort of salary would you give him?
   The agent would probably get about 80 l. or 90 l. a year; in the rural districts probably a good man could be got for less. We have in some of our committees what we call district secretaries, who are gentlemen, and specially trained, and they have 150 l.; that would be in a district where there would be a difficulty in getting volunteers.

4241. Then you would have your volunteer agents being the eyes of this office, and constantly reporting?
   Yes; and they would take care of the case after it had been decided. The case would be decided on in committee and they would undertake to deal with it, or do what was necessary.

4242. I understand you to think that charity properly administered, and the Poor Law properly administered, would cover the whole ground of misery in London?
   So far as it can be dealt with from the point of view of relief. I take for granted that "charity properly administered" means that a great many people are at work with the definite object of placing those they help in a position of self-dependence, helping them to join clubs and so on.

4243. Then I understand you that above all the office of your charity is to endeavour to raise the poor above the Poor Law and make them independent?
   Yes.

4244. Then what is to happen; there is so much neutral ground between charity properly administered and the Poor Law properly administered; can you suggest any remedy for diminishing the amount of that?
   I do not think in practice that is a difficult question, because where you have a good understanding the general line of destitution, coupled with, on the part of the charitable, an inability to do anything to make a person self-dependent, is sufficient.

4245. Earl Spencer.] Is there no other Charity Organisation Society in London which covers the same ground as yours?
   No. There is a Mendicity Society, which has a central office, and which deals more particularly with the mendicity work and is differently organised (70.)
from our own. And there is a Society for the Relief of Distress which is localised throughout London by way of almoners, with whom we co-operate very closely. A great many of their almoners serve on our committees; they do a good deal of the relief work, which naturally comes up in connection with our cases.

4246. But it is a distinct organisation from yours?
Yes; the Society for the Relief of Distress is a distinct organisation; but a co-operating one, which is all we ask.

4247. Does it differ in its principles from yours?
No; in principle it is very similar; in method it is different. The work is in the hands of volunteer almoners, and they visit the cases and so on, and relieve them. They serve on our committees. We in that case arrange for the consultation and the investigation, planning how to help very often, and they take the case up and deal with it as privately as possible.

4248. You do not actually give the money that is to be given?
No; our policy would be to get the money given for the cases and not to give ourselves.

4249. They carry out your decision?
Yes, by serving on the committee; they are one of the parties in question helping to decide; and in many of the districts there may be four or five almoners on the committee.

4250. When you mentioned the sum that passed through your hands in a year, something like 26,000 l., did you include the relief given through this society?
Yes, certainly.

4251. Then, with regard to the Mendicity Society, they must cover some of the same ground as you, I suppose?
Yes and no. They do so far—they would deal with begging-letter cases, and mendicants, and give relief from private individuals for suitable cases. They work at a centre and we work locally; that is the main distinction. But I think the whole system of our local committee work is quite different. They deal more with the mendicant in the street and with the begging-letter writer. We of course have a central department for those cases; and so far as overlapping is concerned, of course in the future we may come to some system of co-operation with them, too.

4252. You said that you thought the Poor Law authorities might very well use the power they have in giving relief to the weak-minded, the deformed, and the blind; you meant by that, that if they did that the money that now is given to those cases would be at the disposal of what you think are more proper objects of charity; is that so?
I think that there are a great many of those cases which are not properly relieved now, and I think that the guardians are in a position to do that work thoroughly, which to a great extent is not done at all.

4253. Not done by special societies?
No; it is most difficult to deal with the cases of feeble-minded persons. They want care and maintenance where they can be looked after; nothing very much, you know, but still, care.

4254. And you are alluding to cases of children, say, not belonging to men or women receiving Poor Law relief?
I am alluding to children who, it may be, are not receiving Poor Law relief; but also to women and others who would fall back naturally upon the rates rather than live a sort of hopeless, struggling life, unable to earn their own living, even at a quite young age.

4255. Then would you relieve this class in the workhouse, or would you have them in special institutions?
In special institutions. The guardians have power to pay subscriptions to institutions or maintain them, according to the Acts I referred to earlier in my evidence.

4256. But do they not, as a matter of fact, very often use these private institutions to relieve cases of that sort?

It is not done to anything like the extent that I think is necessary. Then there is the class of afflicted persons above the pauper rank, and for them it is very difficult to provide, if they want treatment. They cannot afford all that is necessary, and there are literally, in some instances, no institutions for them. It is most difficult to know what to do. London is better off than the provinces; because we have the Metropolitan Asylums Board and their institutions at Caterham and Leavesden, and Darent.

4257. Would you like to see the Metropolitan Asylums Board giving relief to those cases that you consider rather above the pauper line?

No; I am not sure that I should, but I am not sure that there should not be some provision for them; it is a question whether there should not be institutions partly supported by cases sent and paid for by the guardians, partly supported by some possibly rate-aided fund, as lunatics are supported, and partly by voluntary contributions.

4258. How are these cases dealt with now?

From what I gather, I should say that some of these cases were now sent to the Metropolitan Asylums Board's institutions; that is to say, to institutions primarily for the Poor Law.

4259. And you would rather like to see that extended; but are they not well treated when they are sent there?

Very; it is a most elaborate and careful system.

4260. Now you have said that on the whole you thought the Poor Law, as I understand, and the charitable organisation, met nearly all the cases; does it meet cases of destitution; does it meet cases such as we hear of from time to time, where people in great destitution would almost die rather than go to the workhouse?

I should not say that charitable organisation absolutely met it, but I should say that with the co-operation of the charitable an organisation in connection with the Poor Law should meet it. I think that there is a great deal said about these cases which is not quite accurate, and I have myself come across very sensational cases which, on inquiry, have proved quite the reverse of what was publicly stated; and in one instance, of which I have a note here, the question of the inability or ability of the Poor Law to deal with it was made the turning-point of what the magistrate said in regard to the case. Relief came in in large quantities, but it was all simply squandered, and the facts, of course, were not as they were represented. So I think that those cases are a minimum, and you can hardly make special arrangements for a minimum.

4261. But in the case of the minimum that you speak of, could charity meet it?

I think that it could quite easily meet any difficulty of that kind; but of course there is the difficulty. I mean that the difficulty may be reduced to a few cases; but I think it is not a matter of such grave importance as is generally assumed.

4262. Chairman. Do you think there is any responsibility on the community in a case where a man, being offered relief, does not choose to take it?

None, I think.

4263. Lord Balfour. I should like to know what your opinion is about the divergence of practice amongst different unions in the metropolis; I think you have something to say about the want of uniformity in their administration?

First of all it seems to me that inquiry is necessary, very elaborate inquiry, as to the points of divergence. I think Mr. Acworth could give you very good (70.) information.
information as to, for instance, the question of labour yards where the divergence of practice, from that point of view, is such that it seems to me that it is a question whether we do not want something more like a municipal or central control, a supervision as for London. I think that it would be a means of obtaining greater uniformity, and it might be, I should have thought, secured without much difficulty. A constant visitation, a comparison of practice, and so on, between different boards would lead to great change. At present the boards work quite apart. The Metropolitan Poor Law Conferences in London have come to an end practically, and therefore there is very little interchange of views.

4264. You would approve of the continuation of those conferences?
Very much ind-ed.

4265. Do you look rather to a well organised system of communication to secure uniformity than to a large system of central control?
I should look more to the first, but I should think that supervision carried out in a considerate way would be of great service.

4266. Can more be done in the way of giving considerate supervision than the attendance of the central inspector at the meetings of the board of guardians from time to time, and whenever asked?
I could not answer that question fairly.

4267. You have no definite proposals to make as to a future amount of supervision from the central authority?
Yes; I should think there might be very much greater supervision.

4268. In what way?
I should have thought in the way you suggest: more visiting of boards and committees of boards; and I think also that the Local Government Board itself might publish in a cheap form an easily accessible form, more that would be useful to guardians, so that the experience and the progress of one district might be noted and made known to all the guardians in London; and in that way, I think, the central body could do a great deal to make guardians compare practice with practice and improve.

4269. After all, it comes to rather enlightening public opinion among the guardians than any method of what I might call coercion?
I quite agree. It seems to me that what we are gradually getting at is this: I think the guardians are giving more attention to their work; better guardians, persons with ideas, and anxious to make the very best of the administration, are getting on the boards, and all that is wanted is to foster that as much as possible, and to help, I should say, by increased supervision in the way you suggest, and also by the promulgation of every sort of new idea that is found to work at all well.

4270. How far do you think the want of uniformity that exists at the present time is a bar to effective administration?
I think it is a great bar, because you have in one district all the attractions of out-door relief. You may cross, for instance, from Whitechapel to Poplar.

4271. As a matter of fact, do the paupers so cross; if they did, would you not find that they are sent back, and that the one board of guardians would make a claim upon the others, and transfer the paupers back to their place of settlement?
Yes; I know that that is stated, and I believe that is a true argument; but to show how it affects the people in the district in which out-door relief is given, I have heard the guardians of the out-door relief district complain that they had to give out-door relief to cases which had come over the border, a complaint which I do not think was justified; but at the same time it showed how very jealously this question was watched.

4272. But is it not the fact, that as between Poplar and Whitechapel (to take your own instance) there was that complaint made on the part of Poplar, and on
on Poplar being challenged to state the facts, the complaint was found to be almost groundless.

True; but what I mean is this, that the evil of want of uniformity consists in the fact that in one district you have the people made paupers, and in the other district you have the people changed from being paupers; and if the system is good in one district it should be adopted in the other.

4273. Can we in our state of freedom, and accustomed to local institutions, and working them ourselves, do more than endeavour to influence public opinion in what we think the backward districts?

I think we can do more by the change I have suggested as to the election of guardians. I think that having no local qualification would be an advantage to enable you to get a better guardian sometimes. That would do one thing; and I think also that by the system of continuous administration through byelaws being passed by the local board, or on some plan of that kind, you could get a standing example which would, as you say, affect public opinion. I do not think that you can do more. I agree to that.

4274. Would not the imposition of a guardian without a qualification, avowedly for the purpose of teaching the local idea how to do it, be liable to raise up a considerable amount of resentment?

Certainly; and no one ought to be appointed to such a work except a person already of good consideration in the district.

4275. Chairman.] Lord Balfour asked you whether, with our system of local government, further interference would be possible; but is it not the case that throughout the country there is what is termed the Prohibitory Order?

Yes.

4276. Have you considered whether that Prohibitory Order might not be extended to London?

Yes, I think it might; at any rate, by those guardians who have practically adopted it.

4277. Why, if the system is found to work well in Whitechapel and St. George's-in-the-East, should not the Prohibitory Order be extended to London, subject only to its suspension by the Local Government Board if some extraordinary emergency arose rendering it necessary at the time to resort to out-door relief?

Yes; but on the other hand you have to consider what Lord Balfour has referred to, the local feeling; I, for instance, have seen the election addresses of guardians, and one I call to mind in which the plea was that the future guardian would use the rates as though it were charity administered with prudence; and then, again, others are pleading for a judicious extension of out-door relief.

4278. But is not that a very strong argument for the central authority interfering to prevent the possibility of such principles being acted upon?

I think it is.

4279. And is it not the case that in rural unions there are to be found very frequently indeed guardians who hold those same opinions, but they are unable to give effect to them because the central authority had made it impossible by the Prohibitory Order?

That is so.

4280. And do you not think that similar good results would follow from the enforcement of that Prohibitory Order in London, though there might be guardians who would not like it?

Yes, if you could enforce it well.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
The Reverend ANDREW MEARNS is called in; and Examined.

4281. Earl of Aberdeen.] I think you have had a large amount of experience among the poor; would you mention how many years you have had an opportunity of working among the poor in London?

Since the middle of 1883 I have been constantly at work among them.

4282. And previously to that where was your sphere of work?

In Chelsea; I had been a minister there for some 12 years.

4283. Have you been at any time officially connected with Poor Law administration as a guardian?

I have not.

4284. In what districts latterly have you chiefly had your experience?

In 1883, knowing very well the condition of things in the West of London, I made an inquiry into matters in the South of London, dealing specially with the district known as the Mint, on the south side of London Bridge, the immediate neighbourhood of St. George's Church in the Borough, and working in the direction of Bermondsey, to ascertain the condition of the people living in the neighbourhood of the river; afterwards in the East of London, almost all the districts of the East; and in some of the districts of the North of London I have made investigations. The results of these investigations were first of all issued in the statement of the London Congregational Union, entitled "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London," but since that time inquiry has been going on, and is going on still.

4285. Have you formed any definite opinion as to the extent of destitution outside pauperism?

There is a very large extent; I do not think worse now than it was in 1883. I do not think during the last winter it was quite so bad as during the previous one; but there is a very wide area of distress that is not touched by the Poor Law.

4286. When you say "distress," do you mean more than poverty, amounting to destitution?

Amounting to destitution.

4287. Such cases as would be eligible for Poor Law relief if they applied.

If they applied they would be eligible. The objection which they urge to the applying is that it involves the breaking up of the little home which they may have, and they have a very great aversion to the separation of husband and wife.

4288. You are of course referring to places where out-door relief is not given?

There are very few parishes in London that give out-door relief to any extent; it has been diminished exceedingly.

4289. But is there, generally speaking, an antipathy to receiving even out-door relief among the respectable poor?

There is, but they would receive out-door relief rather than go into the house.

4290. Now, as to the proofs and indications of this destitution, could you give us any particular facts bearing upon that?

I have figures here with regard to one Board school. That Board school is in the north of London, Gifford-street, off the Caledonian-road. When visited on a Monday morning 1,533 children were questioned (I mention Monday specially because Monday is the best day in the week; there is less distress on the Monday than there would be on the Friday, because the wages would be coming in on Saturday, if the people were in work at all); the fathers of 745 of these children were reported by the masters and mistresses of that school to be either out of work, or ill, or dead.

4291. Chairman.]
4291. **Chairman.** What time of the year was this?

It was November.

4292. Earl of **Milltown.** Very nearly half the number of the children: 745 out of 1,533.

Yes.

4293. Earl of **Aberdeen.** Have you any further facts with reference to that?

Yes: the total for that school, as reported to me by the officials, of those who came to school breakfastless on that day was 117 out of the 1,533.

4294. In what way was the fact of their coming breakfastless to school ascertained?

The masters and mistresses questioned the children, and I found that in that particular school they had a very intimate acquaintance with the home-life of children. As a proof of that, I may say that I took a list from the masters and mistresses of the children said to come to school without breakfasts, and then I made an independent inquiry. I showed the list to the School Board visitor and the relieving officer, and then sent independent persons to visit the homes; and they reported that 95 per cent. of the cases given they believed to be as reported, which I thought was very good.

4295. In your experience, which I know is very large on other matters connected with the poor, is it the case that children are rather slow to admit the fact that they have come breakfastless, on account of some feeling that it is derogatory to them?

The other children are likely to look down upon them and regard them as being much worse off. There is a great deal of pride even among the poor children; they would be more likely to say that they had had a good breakfast when they had an indifferent one, than to say that they had had none at all.

Besides, if you look at the children, you can see that they have been very badly fed; and in that particular school many of the children could not be taught because they were not properly fed.

4296. Have you any other illustrations in the same direction?

I took the figures out for that one. The facts with regard to the other schools that we investigated were very similar; the proportion would be just about the same. We made an investigation in 10 different districts; I do not think that this one is worse than any of the others, but I took out just the first one that appeared.

4297. The general results of the other cases were similar?

Yes, they were similar.

4298. What steps have you taken, or been concerned in, in endeavouring to relieve the wants of children in that condition?

We have given breakfast to the children attending the penny Board schools, trying to get at only such children as came without a breakfast and would have been without one but for ours. We have tried in every way to prevent the parents leaning upon us to do for their children what they ought to do for them themselves; and we have in all cases given our tickets through the masters and mistresses of the Board schools, so as to ensure that the children who got the breakfasts were those in regular attendance. We have also visited the homes through our own agents to ascertain that these masters and mistresses were giving us satisfactory information; and the results have been exceedingly satisfactory.

4299. How have you endeavoured to mitigate or remove the bad effects which might be feared from any system of eleemosynary treatment of that kind?

The cases that we have had to deal with have been mainly those of children whose fathers were out of work or whose fathers were ill or whose mothers earning a living were unable to procure work at the time; and therefore it has been an absolute necessity; the child would really be without food if we did not
not give it; and we have tried by visiting the parents to influence them to put forth greater effort, if we thought they were not doing all they could, or have given them the opportunity of earning money. We try to develop self-help in every way we can, and only take such children as would be without food, and we never give the same child more than one meal a day.

4309. Have you had any reason to think that this plan has developed in the children a disposition to expect charitable relief?
I do not think so at all; there is no disposition on the part of the children when the father gets into work to come to our breakfasts.

4310. You have endeavoured, as I gather from you, to meet that danger by bringing influence to bear upon the parents.
Yes, and by making our breakfast of the plainest possible kind; not a breakfast that would be a temptation in itself.

4311. Earl of Milltown.] What does it consist of?
In almost all cases, porridge and milk; sometimes followed by bread and jam.

4312. Oatmeal porridge?
Yes.

4313. An excellent and nutritious breakfast?
It is an excellent breakfast of the humblest sort; but not what they would come to if they had anything like a good breakfast at home.

4314. Earl Aberdeen.] There was a great prejudice against it at first, was there not?
Yes, but that prejudice is now being gradually overcome, and now I find that, instead of the poor people coming and asking for bread or money, they come and ask for oatmeal.

4315. You would admit, I suppose, that such an operation as you have described is liable to danger and drawbacks, and requires careful limitation?
Yes, there is nothing more difficult to do than to relieve distress wisely; and, if you do it unwisely, you do far more harm than good. If we did not thoroughly investigate our cases, then I should say that we were doing more harm than good.

4316. Leaving out of question now the children, what steps have you been concerned in, in your endeavouring to relieve adult persons in destitution?
The adult persons amongst whom we have mainly laboured have been those found in the streets at night. I have gone among the one-room people, and the common lodging-house people, and the people that are found sleeping on the stairs in London; but I found that the class that I could do most with were those that were in the streets. Of course there are a goodly number who are in the streets that are very unworthy; but you will also find that a large proportion of those in the streets are not Londoners, but have come up from the country to London looking for work; not finding it, they are in distress, and if you can lay hold of them at that particular moment, and help them into the country again, you have in the easiest way possible relieved the distress of those persons. We have done that in a great many cases; in all cases where there is a home in the country where they could be received.

4317. We have been told several times that a great deal of harm was done by indiscriminate relief being given in the neighbourhood of Trafalgar-square to persons who were found sleeping out, and that that brought a great many others into the same locality; you would agree, I presume, that in that case a great deal of harm was done?
Yes, the normal condition of Trafalgar-square would be perhaps to have twenty or twenty-five homeless people there; but during the time the relief was given, you would have seen 300 to 400 people there; and I had it from some of these people themselves that even half-crowns were given to them by unwise people who had gone there to dispense charity.

4318. Chairman.
4309. Chairman.] Do you think that, if the police were to enforce the law in London as they do in the country, against beggars and vagrants, that would be a sufficient remedy?

That would be a sufficient remedy.

4310. Do you think it would be desirable to do that?

I think it would be very desirable.

4311. Do you not think that the want of enforcing the law causes a great deal of mendicancy in the streets, which otherwise would not exist, and a great deal of which, in point of fact, exists from imposture?

Yes. There is not one man in a hundred that takes to begging that can ever be helped out of it.

4312. Earl of Aberdeen.] Is there a feeling on the part of the public, so far as you are aware, that, though begging is a very bad thing in the abstract, there is the probability or possibility that some of the people whom they see going about in apparent distress may not be adequately relieved, assuming that they are bona-fide persons, from other sources than charity?

Yes; and the feeling is so strong that, when they take to telling a tale, having no true tale to tell, they make twice as much by that as by hard work; and so we have a very large number who live by it professionally.

4313. What would you suggest by way of remedying that state of things?

My plan that I always recommend is: in no case give anything but bread to beggars, and always insist upon their eating it on the spot; and since I have adopted that plan very few cases come to me of the professional beggars; and in private houses where that has been adopted they have not a single caller. The bread must be eaten on the spot, otherwise it is no use.

4314. But notwithstanding your opinion as to the amount of imposture and also the harm done by indiscriminate charity, as in Trafalgar-square, you recognise that there is a very real and wide-spread destitution, and you are anxious to see some method adopted for relieving it?

Very great destitution indeed, and a great deal of it. I reckon that at the present time you would find in London over 500 people any night in the street destitute, and a great many of these would be persons who might be helped.

4315. You do not think it a sufficient argument against any such efforts to prove that at a certain time or on several occasions there was an obvious large amount of imposture, as at Trafalgar-square?

No; I think that any such scheme that was made public could only end in the result that followed. People came from all parts; and with regard to the giving of free lodging-house tickets, I said when it began that instead of having a thousand in the streets, as was estimated then, they would have 30,000 in a very short time; nobody would pay for a ticket if he could get it for nothing.

4316. People are frequently told when they speak of the amount of destitution as represented by the persons in the streets, that at a certain time, for instance, on the occasion referred to, there was a great deal of imposture and harm done by indiscriminate relief; but you hold that apart from that there is a real amount of actual destitution represented in connection especially with those sleeping in the streets?

A great deal indeed. We have found a great many persons in the street and have helped them into positions to maintain themselves; and that is a sufficient proof that they were worthy.

4317. Can you give us any illustrations of your operations in that direction?

We tried an experiment with 100 men, to work for 1 s. a day; and the condition was that they were to give all their time, to work as hard as they could, and to receive 1 s. a day until they had learnt how to do the work; after that they were to be paid by the piece; if they could earn more they would get more. A hundred men were sent down into Lincolnshire, and two months afterwards, (70.)
when I went down, there were 59 of the men still at work in the peat field. They were not bound to stay any longer than they liked. Some of them had found better situations; I think a dozen of them had turned out very badly; but I did not think that was more than might be expected. Some of them were earning 15 s.; one man was earning as much as 25 s.; and a number of these after three months' test in the peat field we helped to emigrate to Canada; and at the present time one man of that hundred in Canada, is having 12 s. a day.

4318. The whole hundred were homeless?
The whole hundred were homeless.

4319. Chairman.] What was the nature of the employment you found for them?
Cutting peat for the manufacture of moss litter for bedding horses.

4320. And was there a deficiency of labour in the district which enabled you to find employment for these men?
The only condition on which they were sent was that the man who had the works would not dismiss a man or reduce the wages of a man, but open up new works.

4321. I did not mean that exactly; but how it was that you were able to secure employment for so large a number of men; whether there was a deficiency of labour of the ordinary kind so that the manager of the works was glad to obtain the services of others?
We were able to get him sale for his moss litter when he employed our men; those who were willing to help us gave him really more work to do.

4322. Was it in the nature of a payment over and above the market price for the peat?
No; he was just paid the market price of the peat.

4323. Earl of Aberdeen.] Will you describe the first steps in the transaction?
The man who had these peat works did not believe in the statements with regard to the distress in London, and he wrote to me to say, "I do not believe one-half of what you say." I said, "If you will come up and see for yourself, I will take your verdict;" and he came up and saw for himself, and said, "It is terrible; I had no idea it was so bad." I said, "Now, I am a practical man; what are you going to do to relieve them? You have made me prove it, and, having proved it, I shall have done no good unless you do something to relieve it." Then he said, "I will take 100 men and see what I can do with them." I said, "I will find you 100." I made it known that I wanted 100 men to go 200 miles into the country to earn 1 s. a day, and I promised them plenty of fresh air and plenty of hard work. I did not know whether they would come or not; but there were 307 in the hall before I got to it, and a number standing outside who could not get in, willing to go to work for 1 s. a day. We selected 100 of those whom we deemed most eligible, and we sent them down; but there were three men who started from King's Cross who were not selected, who walked all the way to Doncaster, and from Doncaster to Mudge Hall, where the peat works are, asking to be taken on at 1 s. a day, and one of the men to whom I referred as having 12 s. a day in Canada was one of the three who walked all the way. In no case did we send anyone to Canada who had not been tested.

4324. Chairman.] What was the class of men from whom you took these 100 men. How did you select them?
They were mostly men from the country; men who had come up to London owing to the agricultural depression; men who were accustomed to work on the land; owing to the depression there has been a large number of men, very deserving men, of that class in London.

4325. When was this?
That is now two years ago; but we have men there now. There is one man there now earning 2 l. a week; another 25 s.; another 30 s., and they commenced at 1 s. a day; they elected to stay on there.

4326. You
4326. You were, in point of fact, rather in the nature of a bureau, to indicate the place where these men could obtain suitable employment?
    Yes, that was so.

4327. Earl of Aberdeen.] What have you to say about houses of refuge?
    We take in special cases into our mission halls; the galleries are so fitted that we can make deal beds at night for really destitute people, and cover them with a rug, while we are making inquiry; but we have no place to lodge them permanently; we only take them in for a night or two while the inquiry is pending.

4328. Chairman.] You know that there are charitable refuges for casual poor in London?
    Yes.

4329. Do you approve of those institutions?
    I do, but I think that to be really useful, they must be very carefully worked. At the present time the persons that I find most deserving are those who would not know where these refuges were, nor how to apply for admission.

4330. But would you think it desirable, as has been suggested by a previous witness, that the guardians of the poor should place an officer in communication with these refuges, so that where there were casual poor applying, not being of the class of vagrants, they should be referred to these refuges where they could obtain rather better accommodation, and what is more important, information as to how they could obtain employment and so be able to earn their own living?
    I put myself into communication with the masters of casual wards, in order that they might send to me persons applying for admission, so that they might be helped; and one of the masters of the casual wards was himself rescued by me in that way, and is now a master; and a splendid missionary he is for selecting good cases. But I think it is most desirable that the Poor Law officials should be in communication with everybody who is trying to help them in the doing of their work. I have never found any difficulty in getting information from them, or in getting their co-operation.

4331. Earl of Aberdeen.] As regards the relief in connection with the refuges or mission halls, have you any labour test house?
    The only labour test that we can adopt in connection with the mission halls is wood chopping, and it is not at all satisfactory. You cannot make it pay to begin with, because you have to teach the men before they can do it, and they do not earn their own money at the beginning; and then you do not want to keep a man permanently at it; as soon as he has learnt it, you want him to go to something else. But I wish I could get a labour test in connection with every hall.

4332. Earl of Milltown.] Is there not one now?
    The wood test; that is the only one.

4333. You do use that?
    Yes, but only to a very limited extent.

4334. Earl of Aberdeen.] Do you find the people willing to take the work at the small rate of a shilling a day?
    One shilling a day is what I offer, and we have such numbers coming to get one shilling a day that we have three sets in the week. We cannot give a man six days' work but two days, and then we put on another man for two days.

4335. We have once or twice heard that people have applied for relief and have had work offered to them, and they have taken it for a day or two days, and then dropped it; is that your experience?
    You would find a goodly number who would do that; not the class we find in the streets at night.

(70.) 3 O 4 4336. You
4336. You get hold of a better class than the one I referred to?
We found a great many do what you have said at the beginning of our work, but they do not come to us at all now, because they know that they will be tested.

4337. Is there not often a confusion on the part of many persons in connection with that, that they have heard of cases of a considerable number of men refusing to work or deserting it, and therefore they have come to the conclusion that all those persons apparently in destitution are persons who would be unwilling to work if they had the chance?
I believe it to be a mistake although a very widespread opinion.

4338. Have you anything to suggest as to any possible classification of different kinds of people who need relief, or who apply for relief?
It is very difficult to suggest any classification. The class that have to seek relief with whom I have the most sympathy are aged couples going into the workhouse; their separation when they are over 60 years of age.

4339. You are aware that there is a regulation which entitles such persons not to be separated?
I did not know that; they are constantly telling me that they are afraid to go because of that.

4340. Chairman.] That has not been a very long time in force, and I think it is probable that a good many of them are ignorant of it?
That meets their difficulty.

4341. Earl of Aberdeen.] You did not observe the report of a recent case of starvation, where it was said that an old couple had a great aversion to entering the workhouse, and when it was stated in the inquiry that they could have gone in together, one of the guardians stated that he was not aware that there was such a regulation; you did not notice that report?
I saw the case, but I did not notice that.

4342. I was alluding rather to the classification or discrimination between persons who have not the smallest hesitation to enter the workhouse when it is convenient, and, on the other hand, persons who have a great reluctance to enter it, and are only driven there by dire necessity, and one of whose objections to entering is the class of persons with whom they have to associate?
It is most desirable, if they could be separated, and if the treatment could be different, that that should be done. The habitants I would subject to the severest labour before admitting them; but those who are only there occasionally, or only once there, I think ought not to be put with that class; they get a great deal of harm from being put with them; but I do not see how they can be separated.

4343. Do you think that, with the growing tendency to dispense with outdoor relief and make the offer of the house the method of relief, there is an increasing need for some such classification?
There is no doubt of the need at all.

4344. As to the casual-ward system, have you any suggestion to make based upon your experience on that subject?
I have gone into the matter of the casual wards somewhat carefully, visited the wards, and got information which, I think, was thoroughly reliable in regard to them. The great difficulty I see in working that system is the keeping men in until nine or ten and eleven o'clock in the morning, and that not the morning after the evening when they are admitted, but being kept a whole day and then let out on the following morning at nine or eleven. I know that the masters have discretionary power, but that power is hardly ever exercised, and I should prefer very much to have the men let out earlier. If one of these men is going to get work, he would get it early in the day, but under the present system, he must idle away the afternoon, and wait till night before he can be admitted to the casual ward. I would have the casual ward opened at midday and let a man go in as early as he liked and begin to do his task; then let him out next morning at five or six o'clock; he gets then the chance of finding work; but if you
you do not let him out till nine or eleven the work that he would have a chance of getting is all gone for the day, and he must go to a casual ward at night again if he cannot find work.

4345. As to the system adopted towards the inmates of casual wards, do you think that there is any urgent need for distinction there between the habitual casual and the man bond fide in search of work?

If you could separate the two it would be an immense boon; the great drawback to the casual ward is the mixing of the classes.

4346. Have you any instances which you could quote indicating the absence of the use of that discretionary power which the masters have?

Cases have come under my notice; I have not the names and dates here, but I have been told of such cases, where they have told the master of the casual ward that if they could get out at six o'clock they could get work, and they have produced a written statement as evidence of that fact, but have been refused, and lost the situation they might have had.

4347. Is it not reasonable to understand that the master of such an establishment, having been brought into contact with a vast amount of imposture of several kinds, would form a habit of not listening to such statements, but treat the cases as cases which ought to be dealt with by rule?

Quite so. I thought the written evidence would have proved an exception; it has not made an exception in cases that have come under my knowledge.

4348. You think such cases point to real hardship brought to bear upon persons who have been compelled to resort to the casual wards?

Yes.

4349. Have you been led to form any opinion as to the possibility of carrying on any system of relief works in a time of emergency that would not be likely to create fresh difficulties; I mean by fresh difficulties such difficulties as have often been experienced or pointed out in connection with anything like a public system of relief works?

No, I have not. We have been giving relief in our way, but it has been quietly done, and always through local persons visiting the cases and continuing to visit them. In can only be wisely done, I think, in that way.

4350. You think if a large amount of publicity is given there are sure to be difficulties arising from the influx of persons wishing to get work?

I have always thought that any very public appeal always did more harm than good, because the people flock to get relief, and the really deserving ones do not get it.

4351. Is there any other point on which you wish to give evidence?

I do not think so.

4352. Lord Balfour.] Were you ever a guardian?

No.

4353. I understand you to express the opinion that there is a considerable area of distress outside the present Poor Law?

Yes.

4354. What do you refer to exactly?

I mean that there are a good many people who are not receiving relief who are really in distress, not able to maintain themselves and their families; people who are not getting poor relief.

4355. What do you infer from that?

I infer that there is not sufficient work for them; that they cannot get work. Take the dock labourers, for example; there must be at the least, I should say, four men at the gates for every man that is employed; three must be without employment; and very few of these are getting relief, and they would not apply unless they were driven to it. If they could even get two days' work a week they would keep from asking for relief; yet they are in distress.
4356. Do I understand that they do not ask for relief? They do not, but they are distressed all the same.

4357. What do you infer from that as to anything in the administration of the Poor Law? The Poor Law would not touch that.

4358. Can you conceive a state of circumstances in which there will not always be a number of people upon the very verge of pauperism? Not at all.

4359. You said that people would prefer to get out-door relief to indoor relief? Yes.

4360. What argument do you found upon that? The objection to indoor relief is the breaking up, as I said, of their homes. Supposing they have a furnished room, the furniture must go, and they must go into the house; when they come out of the house they have no place to live in; they must take a furnished room, which would usually cost double the rent of the unfurnished, or three times as much; and they would be kept constantly poor, if they were able to come out again.

4361. But is it not the fact that before the time when that class of persons is brought face to face with the necessity of applying for relief, their furniture has practically gone already? All excepting the bed and tables and chairs: anything that they can spare; but they must have some place to sleep on, and they will not part with that to the very last; very likely they borrow money upon it, and keep it at the same time.

4362. In a case of that kind should you be in favour of a provision whereby the head of the house would be relieved indoors, the others being left in the home, the man being allowed out for a specified number of days a week for the purpose of looking for work? I have not considered that, but I should say that the man is the one that ought to be out; the wife and children being taken care of until he should find work.

4363. But would not that be the breaking up of the home? No; he might keep the furniture and the room, and occupy it while he is looking for work. But I think in a case of that kind, what I should recommend, would be that the man should be temporarily relieved and allowed to look for work, that he might be able to support himself again.

4364. Would not the effect of that be unfair to those who will struggle upon the very verge of poverty, and had not actually applied for relief? It would be open to that objection, certainly.

4365. Would not the system which I have endeavoured to indicate to you, be free at any rate from that one objection? Yes, it would be.

4366. And would not the risk in the proposal which you advocate be that if, with a certain class of men at any rate, you once got the wife and children into the house, the men might migrate elsewhere, and not be easily traced? That might be; but there might be a plan of taking care of the furniture if they were all taken into the house, and giving it back to them. If that could be done the whole difficulty would be got over.

4367. Chairman.] Is there not this further objection, that such temporary relief tends to depress wages, because if employers find that the men when temporarily out of work are supported out of the rates until it is convenient to them to employ them again, they will naturally employ them less continuously, and will give them less wages? It would very likely be so.

4368. Lord
4368. Lord Balfour of Burley.] As regards the administration of the Poor Law, what inference did you draw from the fact that you found 117 of the children out of 1,533 breakfastless?

I do not think that touches the Poor Law relief; it is a question of charity.

4369. What was the particular state of circumstances of the 745 children out of the 1,533; you made one statement in which you said that 745 children out of the 1,533 were in what condition?

Their fathers were out of work, or ill, or dead; they either had no fathers or the fathers were ill, or if they were well, they were out of work.

4370. What was the inference you drew from that?

That there must be a great deal of distress when so many were without some one to care for them.

4371. Do you know that none of those 745 were children of widows who were actually in receipt of relief at that very time?

A number of them would be the children of widows, but I do not know that they were in receipt of relief.

4372. But do you know that they were not some of them in receipt of relief?

No, I do not know at all.

4373. Any number of them might have been?

Any number might have been.

4374. You said that any night you could find 500 in the streets, all of whom might be destitute?

Many of whom might be.

4375. And you gave us some facts from your own experience to show that it was so?

Yes; more than half of all that you find would be persons not belonging to London, and those that do not belong to London are those that I think are most easily helped.

4376. But they would belong to the mendicant class, would they not?

No, a great many of them would not; they have just got to the point when their money is gone; they had come up to London having a little money; the money has got exhausted, they do not know the haunts where they could find a bed for nothing, and they are found wandering about not knowing what to do.

4377. But at the same time I think I understood you to say that it would be more fitting that they should be relieved by a proper system of co-operation between private charity and the Poor Law, rather than that they should be allowed to go upon the Poor Law at all?

Quite so.

4378. What is the particular object of your policy in relieving men in relays, two days a week at 2s. a day rather than giving a limited number of men more adequate employment?

We do not find employment for people permanently at all; it is relief work on a small scale, and if we can give a man money for two days a week he manages, perhaps, to keep his home above his head, and if we can do that to three instead of one, we think we have done a greater good; we do not want them to come to us.

4379. You mean that you think it is a better thing to give three men 4s. a week a-piece than one 12s. ; in such case as a temporary thing?

I think so, because we do not want them to continue.

4380. A man cannot support himself, especially if he has a family, upon 4s. a week?

No, he cannot support himself as he ought to support himself, but they get along.

(70.)
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4381. I suppose
4381. I suppose because they go to other places which pursue the same policy?
No, they could not do that, because we take those that are resident in the neighbourhood of the hall where they are employed; and they are visited and report themselves; they come up to the hall usually in the morning to look for advertisements, whether men are wanted anywhere; and we should know whether the men were working in any other place.

4382. But they must be doing so if they have only 4 s. a week, must they not?
No, they manage to live upon it; they get behind with the rent probably, but they manage to live upon it.

4383. Do you think that they are in any way permanently helped by that course of proceeding?
Yes, helped; they are tided over a time of difficulty until they can get work, and being only two days in the week employed they have four days to go about and look for work.

4384. I understood you that they came up to you and reported themselves every day; how do you prove the negative that they did not get employment elsewhere?
I cannot prove it in any other way than that.

4385. Do you think you effectually do prove that they do not get other work of a similar kind?
I do not think it possible for them.

4386. At the same time they must be out of your sight and knowledge a sufficient length of time to enable them to be getting this other work if they so thought fit?
Yes.

4387. Would it not be better, if, even though you were actually relieving a more limited number of cases, you were relieving that limited number of cases more effectually?
We want them to get off our hands as quickly as possible, and therefore we think that by giving them just a little as is absolutely necessary they will be more likely to strive to get something better.

4388. The policy being such as you indicate, the point is whether you are not giving them so much less than they may necessarily require that they are getting help elsewhere, and in each case getting it in small quantities and getting it without due inquiry into their circumstances?
They may, of course; I cannot say that they do not.

4389. Earl of Milltown.] With regard to the position of the fathers of the children, how did you ascertain the facts; simply by inquiring from the children?
From the children first of all; then from the School Board visitor, who can in all cases tell you what the position of the father is, because there would be the non-payment of the fee. Then the Poor Law relieving officer will tell you whether any of the parents are receiving relief; and then from visiting the homes you will see; and the masters and mistresses are, after all, very good judges as to whether the children are telling you the truth, and whether these children are not properly fed.

4390. I was not speaking so much about the matter of breakfasts as about the facts of their being orphans, or their fathers being disabled or out of work?
These facts are furnished by the officials of the school, and I think they may be relied on.

4391. You stated that there are 500 persons destitute every night in the streets of London; do you mean by that that they are starving?
I mean that they are homeless, without food, without money, and without friends.

4392. Are
4392. Are they not aware that they can get relief in the casual wards? Some of them are, but many are not.

4393. I suppose if they spoke to a policeman, he would tell them? Yes; but people from the country are afraid to speak to a policeman.

4394. That is rather a charge against their character? They are afraid of being locked up for being about the streets without means of employment.

4395. But as a matter of fact they can always get shelter? Yes.

4396. Was I right in understanding one of your answers to mean that according to your experience there are a large number of agricultural labourers coming up to London? Not so many just now as there were; but a good many agricultural labourers have come up to London owing to the depression; there are still a number but not so many as there were.

4397. When did the numbers begin to decrease? This last year it has not been so large as the year before.

4398. Chairman.] We have been told by several previous witnesses that the agricultural labourers who came up to London rather displaced other men from their employment in London, and in that way increased the destitution, and that the agricultural labourers themselves found employment readily because they were stronger and more able men. Your experience seems to be rather the contrary:

I found a great many who could not get any employment at all, and we sent a goodly number of those abroad.

4399. Earl of Milftown.] Does the diminution of their numbers which you have spoken of arise in your opinion from the fact that it has become known to them that they cannot get employment in London. The agricultural depression remains pretty much as it was, I suppose. Does the diminution arise from the cause which I have suggested?

Yes, everything has been done to dissuade them from coming to London.

4400. You think that the early discharge of casuals from the workhouse, instead of being as it is now an exception, ought to be made the rule? Yes, I would have it made the rule.

4401. Then you would provide for the test-work being done before? Yes.

4402. Earl of Strafford.] Where is your mission hall? We have mission halls all over London. I am Secretary of the London Congregational Union, and we have them in all parts of London.

4403. How many? I have ten here on my list.

4404. In different directions? Yes; north, east, and south.

4405. What are the regulations under which you admit persons? They come and state their case, and the superintendent of the hall deals with the case.

4406. At what hour of the day do you admit them? The hall is open all day long.

4407. And what time in the morning do they go out in quest of work? When we have a number in, they are turned out at six in the morning; they can get out at five if they like.

(70.)
4408. How long have these halls been established?
They have been established for more than three years.

4409. Chairman.] How do you select cases which are to be relieved at your halls; on what principle?
We first of all give immediate relief in the shape of bread, until inquiries have been prosecuted.

4410. To anyone that applies?
To anyone that applies. We take down what they have to say; then we say, "Now give us the references, and we will make inquiries;" but until we have personally inquired into the case, we do nothing more than give them bread to eat.

4411. Then what is the next step; you make inquiry, and upon what principles do you then select?
The cases that are most deserving are those that we take up first.

4412. How do you define a deserving case?
If we find a man's character is good up to date, and we find that his explanation of his present condition is one that is satisfactory to us, we immediately try to help that man and his family.

4413. Now take a case. Supposing the application was made in winter, and you find that the man is a painter and has earned very good wages all the summer long, from which he has saved nothing, do you consider that a case for relief at your hall?
It is a case in which a man is very much to blame; but it is a case in which I should relieve his children and talk to him.

4414. But do you not think that a system of out-door relief, which is the one you administer to men in those circumstances, tends directly to discourage thrift?
I do not think so at all.

4415. Can you tell me why?
Because these men would not save one penny more if we did not exist, and if we did not give any relief whatever.

4416. Might I ask what reason you have for having come to the conclusion that they would not save?
Because they never have, before we were in existence.

4417. But of course yours is only one of many agencies that exist of the same kind, and you probably do not relieve any very large number of people; and I should like to know on what ground you think that the apparently obvious consequences of such a system as you pursue would not follow?
I can only give my opinion.

4418. Your opinion is that if a man finds in the winter he can obtain relief easily, having been in receipt of high wages and not saved anything in the summer, that will not be a further inducement to him not to save?
The relief he will receive from us will be so small that his sufferings, as the result of his own folly, will be sufficient to teach him wisdom. If we were to put the man in a comfortable position, notwithstanding what he had done that was wrong, we should be encouraging the wrong-doer; but if the man suffers, notwithstanding the little relief that is given, and his family are not punished for what he has done, I do not see that it is so grievous a wrong.

4419. You prefer your test to the test applied by the Poor Law?
I think so.

4420. Then having thus selected the man, is the amount of relief given proportioned in any way to the size of his family?
It is, but we always try to get the man out of the position of needing relief.
4421. No doubt it is your subsequent endeavour to do so, but I am speaking of the time during which he actually receives the relief from you; and then you proportion the relief, I understand, to the size of the family?

Quite so.

4422. In what way do you think that your system differs from the Poor Law out-relief, except by being given by charitable agencies; are the consequences likely to be different?

The Poor Law does not give out-door relief, except in a very few cases; they refuse it in almost all cases, and it is where they would refuse it that we should have to take it up.

4423. But surely though the law is strictly administered in some parts of London, there are parts of London, as this Return I hold in my hand shows, where there is a great deal of out-door relief given?

I do not think you will find it in the East of London nor in the South of London.

4424. I find in Holborn, for example, that there is 227 per 1,000 of the population that have relief given to them in the shape of out-door relief, the average of London being 10.9; and I could give other instances?

That is central.

4425. But there are other instances; wherever out-door relief is given, I suppose that the system, except, no doubt, that in the one case it is charity, and in the other it is given from the rates, is very much the same as yours?

Quite the same.

4426. Has it not been found that the tendency of giving out-door relief is to increase pauperism?

I have not found it so; I cannot say. I cannot answer the question.

4427. You have never formed any opinion on that?

No.

4428. Do you think that out-door relief may be safely given upon a large scale in London, instead of relief in the workhouse?

It would not be safe to give it on a large scale in London. I was curious to watch those who received out-door relief when I was in Chelsea; and a large number of those who received loans of money made their way direct to the public-house. The proportion of them was very great indeed.

4429. The danger is that there will be a great deal of what is virtually imposture?

Yes.

4430. Do you think that your arrangements are such that you are not subject to this imposture?

We are subject to this imposture; but we so constantly visit, and have the persons under inspection of large bodies of volunteer agents, that it is very difficult to impose upon us.

4431. So that, really, what is the saving part of your arrangement is that you have a thorough and complete system of inquiry and inspection, such as could not be expected from the Poor Law?

It could not be expected from it.

4432. Some witnesses have suggested that the casual wards might be altogether dispensed with, and that all applicants for relief should be received into the workhouse; do you think that would be a practicable or a desirable system?

I do not think it would be desirable. I think the casual ward fills a very desirable vacancy at the present time, and everything should be done to keep people out of the workhouse.

(70.)
4433. Do you think that there is something more demoralising in the workhouse than in the casual ward?

Well, when once they get into the workhouse they are not the same; they do not seem to care about coming out or working for themselves. I would do everything I could to help them to help themselves outside.

4434. It has also been sug-ges-ted that there should be much larger powers of detention of casual paupers; that is to say, that if they had within a month, say, come several times in and out of the casual ward you should be able to detain them; do you think that would be desirable?

It would be a very desirable thing for the regular tramps, for the vagrants.

4435. It might possibly be a regulation enabling the regular tramp to be so dealt with, whilst those not of that class might be dealt with in a different manner?

Quite so.

4436. That would be, in point of fact, a branch of better classification?

Quite so.

4437. Earl of Aberdeen.] Would you describe your method as an illustration of applying a well-ordered charitable organisation for relieving those who do not come under the relief from the rates; in fact, an illustration of the co-operation between charitable relief and Poor Law relief?

That is what we are aiming at. There is one point which I should like to just mention. We do not take cases that need permanently to be relieved. I deal with cases that I think by a little help, it may be gener-ous help, would be taken out of the class of those needing relief; and it is always to put them in the way of helping themselves that I aim.

4438. Chairman.] You wish to strike at the root of pauperism by lifting these persons out of that class into the class of men who can support themselves?

Quite so; if they are in the class, and likely to remain in it, then it is no use my touching them.

4439. Earl of Milltown.] Am I right in supposing that you do not advocate the abolition of out-door relief?

No; I think that there should be out-door relief, but it should always be very carefully given.

4440. But you are in favour of a certain amount of it?

Yes, a certain amount of it.

4441. Earl of Strafford.] Have you a list of your mission halls?

The following are specially for mission work:

- Colliers Rents' Hall, Long-lane, Borough.
- Midland Hall, Queen-street, Rat-cliff.
- Old Gravel-lane, Wapping.
- Buckingham Hall, Pimlico.
- Wardour Hall, Soho.
- Harrow-road Hall, Queen's Park.
- Milton Hall, Battersea.
- Bruce-road, Bromley-by-Bow.
- Gifford Hall, Caledonian-road.

We have eight additional centres at which breakfasts and dinners are provided for poor children.

4442. Chairman.] Could you tell us about what number of persons you have relieved during the year?

The number is at least 20,000; the cases of relief have exceeded 138,000.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Right Honourable the Lord Balfour of Burley, (a Member of the Committee), being present; is Examined, as follows:

4443-4. Chairman.] In order to save Sir Hugh Owen the trouble of coming, you hand in some Returns from the Local Government Board?

Yes.
Yes. This first Return is the one which is referred to in the answer to Question 26 of Sir Hugh Owen's evidence, and it is a comparative statement of the pauperism of the metropolis from the year 1857 till the year 1888. It gives in the first column the estimated population; in the second column the gross number of paupers relieved on the last day of the last week of January in each year; and in the third column the number of paupers in every 1,000 of the inhabitants worked out to the estimated population; and I should like also to be allowed, for the information of the Committee, to give in the Returns of the metropolitan pauperism to the last available date, the second week of June of the present year; and it is more especially with reference to the opinions expressed by Lord Compton the other day; and it will be satisfactory to the Committee to know that, although at the commencement of the present year there was an increase over the corresponding period of 1885 of about 15,000, that increase has now fallen to 7,000, and the actual increase of this week, the second week of June this year, over the second week of June last year, is only 2,176; and I would like to say that over the 30 unions of the metropolis there is an actual decrease in no less than 12, and an increase only in the other 18. Therefore, it cannot be said that, so far as any figures in the possession of the Local Government Board go, there is any reason for apprehending a continual alarming progressive increase. The figures for the four years in the second week of June are these: in 1885, 85,026; in 1886, 87,834; in 1887, 90,326; and in 1888, 92,502.

And allowance must be made for the increase of population?
Yes, that is so.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Lunae, 25° Junii, 1888.
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The Earl of Kimberley, K.G., in the Chair.

Mr. William Vallance, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

4446. Chairman.] You have been for some time Clerk to the Guardians of the Whitechapel Union, have you not?

Yes, for about 20 years.

4447. There was considerable change of policy in the Whitechapel Union about the year 1870, I believe?

Yes.

4448. Will you state what has been the system previous to 1870, and what the nature of the change was?

Up to 1870 the system may be said to have been that of meeting apparent existing circumstances of need by small doles of out-door relief; the in-door establishments—at that time consisting of a mixed workhouse for the adult sick and healthy poor and a separate school at Forest Gate—being reserved for the destitute poor who voluntarily sought refuge in them. Able-bodied men who applied for relief on account of want of employment were set to work under the Out-door Relief Regulation Order, and, in return for such work, were afforded out-door relief in money and kind. Under this system, the administration was periodically subjected to great pressure, so much so that the aid of the police had, not unfrequently, to be invoked to restrain disorder, and afford necessary protection to officers and property. Police protection was even at times required for the guardians during their administration of relief. The experience of the writer, 1869-70, however, was such as to lead the guardians to review their position and earnestly to aim at reforming a system which was felt to be fostering pauperism and encouraging idleness, improvidence, and imposture, whilst the "relief" in no true sense helped the poor. It was seen that voluntary charity largely consisted of indiscriminate almsgiving, that it accepted no definite obligation as distinct from the function of Poor Law relief, that the Poor Law was relied upon to supplement private benevolence, that the almsgivers too frequently were the advocates of the poor in their demands upon the public rates, and that both Poor Law and charity were engaged in the relief of distress, much of which a thoughtless benevolence and a lax relief administration had created. This condition of things the guardians resolved to amend. Looking forward to the ultimate possibility of laying down a broad distinction between "legal relief" and "charitable aid," and of interpreting the former as relief in the workhouse, or other institution, for the actually destitute, and the latter as personal sympathy and helpful charity, (70.)
they began by gradually restricting out-door relief in "out-of-work" cases, until they were able to entirely suspend the Out-door Relief Regulation Order, and to apply strictly the principle of the Prohibitory Order. Thus, the labour-yard was in the course of the year (1870) closed, and it has not since been re-opened. In this process of restriction it was found that about one in ten of those who were offered in-door, in place of out-door relief, entered the workhouse, and these, in turn, gradually withdrew themselves, so that eventually the in-door pauperism resumed its normal condition.

4449. Then in point of fact you have been acting very much as if the Prohibitory Order applied to the Whitechapel Union?

Precisely so.

4450. Taking the various classes of the poor, will you describe how they are now dealt with in your union, taking first the cases where the head of the family is sick, he being an able-bodied man?

At present by reason of the perfect understanding which exists between the guardians and the Charity Organisation Society, and indeed workers for the poor generally, the guardians are enabled to say to the sick man if he is not in a benefit club that he will be received into the infirmary. The infirmary now is a separate building under medical administration equal it may be said to a general hospital. By admitting the man to the infirmary we take security for his early recovery, as well as for his early entrance into the labour market again. With regard to his family as a rule where they have been struggling, and are really deserving, there is no difficulty whatever in finding charity available at once; but otherwise we admit part of the family with him. We have never found a difficulty. The relieving officers have always been instructed to be on the alert lest charity should fail in its duty of looking after the family of a man in the infirmary; but we have not found a case in which it has been necessary to interpose with relief in kind.

4451. You are acting in these cases, are you not, under what is known as the Whitechapel Order?

No, the Whitechapel Order was issued to Whitechapel to meet exceptional distress if it should arise. It was only to operate for twelve months. I may say that it was regarded by the guardians, and probably by the Local Government Board, as an experimental order, and as a matter of fact it was never put into operation.

4452. Will you state what it was?

Article 1 is: "the guardians of the poor of the said Whitechapel Union may, after not less than seven days' notice of the proposal has been sent by their clerk to each guardian, pass a resolution to the effect that the powers conferred by this order shall be exercised by them, and a copy of such resolution shall be forwarded to us by the clerk within one week of the same having been passed." And Article 2 is: "from and after the passing of such resolution, and during a period not exceeding twelve calendar months from the date hereof, it shall be lawful, in the case of any able-bodied male person relieved in the workhouse who shall not in any one week ending on Saturday be absent from the workhouse more than once, nor for a period exceeding twenty-four hours, nor without the consent of the guardians, for the guardians to relieve out of the workhouse the wife and family of such able-bodied person, and also such person whilst he is so absent from the workhouse as aforesaid, without setting such person to work during the time, or any part thereof, that he is so absent, anything in the above cited general order to the contrary notwithstanding."

4453. You have not found it necessary to act upon that order, because all persons, the heads of whose families have been relieved in the workhouse, you find can be relieved by charitable means?

They can be and they are.

4454. If no charitable means were forthcoming, you would of course, I conclude, take the family into the workhouse?
In the early days of restriction, when charity was not available to the extent that it is now, and when there was not the organization of charity that exists now, the practice of the guardians in the case of a man applying for relief on account of sickness, was to ask him questions in regard to his antecedents, specially as to whether he had ever belonged to a benefit club. A man would probably answer, as many do, that he had never been in a benefit club, he had never thought of it; he was earning good wages when he contracted marriage, and he thought he could get along as well as others; that he could do as others do. That is the general answer. The guardians would at once say, "Now, supposing we tide you over present difficulties will you promise that you will join a sick club so as in case of future sickness not to have to rely upon the parish?" Where the guardians were satisfied that there was an honest intention as well as ability to do so, they would relieve him temporarily during that illness, and the relieving officer would be instructed to make a note of the case, so that if the man should come up again, he would only receive indoor relief. In that way in the early days the relief was as far as possible made educational.

4455. Are many of the men now in the Whitechapel Union in benefit clubs?

I am unable to say what the relative proportions are, but I am disposed to think that a good many have, by reason of the policy of administration, been led to join benefit clubs.

4456. But do you think that they rely now upon obtaining this charitable relief much in the same way as people formerly relied upon getting out-door relief?

No, for the reason that, although the infirmary is an institution almost equal to a general hospital, the very fact of its separating the man from his family is in itself a certain test. Whatever the conditions of maintenance may be in the infirmary, the relief is not so eligible as relief with his own family would be. Consequently there is an inducement to join clubs.

4457. You mean that it is not so desirable from their point of view as outdoor relief would be; but I suppose that it is more desirable from their point of view as well as from yours, than in-door relief for the whole family, when the home would be broken up?

Clearly.

4458. Allowing for the difference which you have very rightly pointed out, I would again ask you whether you think the poor in Whitechapel now rely very much in such cases upon obtaining what is equivalent to out-door relief for their families from charitable organisation?

There is no doubt that the arrangements of the modern infirmary are less deterrent than under the old system in an ordinary workhouse; and possibly the almost certainty of a respectable family obtaining charitable aid outside, may offer some inducement to rely upon it, but to nothing like the extent that out-door relief did.

4459. But must it not have to a considerable extent the effect of discouraging thrift, inasmuch as the man can fairly look forward to his family being provided for in such cases, and therefore does not feel the necessity of making provision himself?

I do not think that it can be regarded as a certainty of provision. The Charity Organization Society, for instance, in the case of a man admitted to the infirmary or the workhouse, would make their usual inquiry, and it is those who have homes worth preserving, those who have given some evidence of having exercised thrift, that are assisted. In other cases the Charity Organization Society would probably refuse help, so that there could be no certainty; and where it was refused, then a portion of the family would be offered admission with the head of the family, the mother and the youngest child probably being left out, so that she might achieve independence if she could, and tide over the period of her husband's illness. So that it is not a uniform grant by the (70.)
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Charity Organization Society, or what I may term a system of Poor Law administration outside the Poor Law with the same certainty.

4460. I think you told us just now that practically you were able to secure that in all those cases where the man is relieved in the workhouse, the family will find relief outside from the Charity Organization Society. That, however, must of course be qualified with the very proper limitations placed upon that relief by the Charity Organization Society; that it is only given in deserving cases?

It is only given in deserving cases, and where there is clearly a home worth preserving.

4461. Will you tell me what is the arrangement in undeserving cases which, I suppose, in Whitechapel are unfortunately not very uncommon?

Where a case is referred back to the relieving officer as being ineligible for charitable aid, relief in the infirmary, workhouse, or school is offered to the whole family; but the wife is never compelled to enter the workhouse with her husband, and so she is able, if willing, to keep the home together and maintain one, and sometimes two, children by her own hands until her husband's discharge.

4462. Will you explain what to me is quite unintelligible; it appears that if the family is not deserving the Charity Organization Society very properly will not help them. Then if we assume, as I suppose we must, that there are the usual number of persons in Whitechapel seeking relief who are not deserving, how do you explain the fact that it appears that the undeserving people are able to do without charity altogether?

Probably in Whitechapel it is explained by the fact that the wives are wage-earners as well as the husbands, and that they contribute even during the time that the husband is at work, to the earnings of the family. If it is a case in which charity does not intervene, in the majority of other cases the woman is engaged in some work by which she obtains wages, and then she either maintains her family, or allows one, two, or three children to come into the workhouse.

4463. But there are a certain number of cases where the wife without any fault of her own is unable from infirmity to earn anything; in those cases do they come into the house?

In such a case the Charity Organization Society would not hesitate to help.

4464. Although the family was an undeserving one?

I do not quite follow the question.

4465. What do you understand by deserving poor to whom the Charity Organization Society offer relief as distinguished from undeserving poor?

By "deserving poor" I should mean those who give some evidence of thrift and forethought, who have led industrious, respectable lives, who it is seen can, by temporary aid coupled with sympathy and advice, be brought within the reach of possibilities. For instance, a person may be set up in business, or introduced to employment, or have his tools or goods redeemed from pawn, or have his rent paid, or the means given him of migrating to where labour is; each and all of which the Poor Law cannot do, or is expressly prohibited from doing.

4466. Would you include amongst the deserving poor, for example, a family the head of which had had very large wages throughout the summer, and in the winter, having laid by nothing, came upon charity for support?

No, I should not.

4467. Have you not a good many people in Whitechapel of that kind?

Yes, probably.

4468. What become of their families when the men are sick and apply for relief?

If a man applies for relief on account of sickness during the winter months and is not relieved by charity, admission to the workhouse of the whole or a portion
portion of the family is offered; but as a matter of fact these cases are very few.

4469. You have explained to me what happens in cases where the women earn wages, but what takes place in the case of women who do not earn wages, I have been unable to extract from you. They apparently can live without charity and without relief from the rates.

The relief which is obtained through the Charity Organization Society is not the only form of voluntary relief that is obtained; but where there is destitution, and voluntary charity is not available, relief in the workhouse or other institution is promptly afforded.

4470. You just now mentioned that in cases where it was necessary to relieve the family, as well as the man, you offered relief to a portion only of the family; have you any authority under the law to do that; have not the wife and family a right to claim relief if the head of the family is relieved?

There is no doubt that under the Prohibitory Order, where a man is admitted into the workhouse, his wife and children should be admitted with him.

4471. They must be admitted if they demand it?

Yes, clearly. The only cases in which part of a family, and not the whole, is admitted, are those in which the arrangement is elected and desired by the applicant.

4472. Have they any legal power to limit it to a part of the family?

I do not regard that Prohibitory Order as applying in case of sickness.

4473. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Would it not be this: that you would offer relief to the whole family if they chose to take it, but that if they did choose to take it you would say, "Well, we will ease you by taking a part of the family"?

Yes, precisely.

4474. Is it a matter of contract between you and the pauper?

It may be said to be a matter of contract in this sense that the pauper has the alternative offered of admission for the whole, or part, of the family.

4475. Chairman.] I quite understand that it is not incumbent upon the whole of them to take that relief; but I believe I am right in saying that it is incumbent upon the guardians to offer relief to the whole of them?

Yes, clearly.

4476. Leaving the case of able-bodied sick men, how do you deal with the infirm and aged; those who are unable to work either from permanent infirmity or from old age.

In the early days of restriction the guardians did not refuse out-door relief altogether to the aged, but sought rather to introduce the element of uncertainty into the grant of a "parish allowance." As far as possible they avoided allowing the relief to become a permanent pension. The grant of relief for a temporary period was followed by inquiries as to the antecedents of the applicant, as to the existence of relatives legally liable to maintain him, or of those morally bound to care for him, and as to the extent of charitable help given or available; and, as far as possible, the poor and their relatives and charitable friends were led to see that the guardians were setting themselves against permanent weekly pensions to the aged poor out of the rates. But when we reached a system of co-operation with outside agencies, then we found established in our midst the Tower Hamlets Pension Society to take charge of these very cases, and the representatives of that charity in the board-room were enabled to say to the guardians: "Pray do not let this man or this woman taste parochial relief at all. The case being one of exceptional distress, or desert, we will deal with it." In that way we were enabled to close the doors even against aged cases.
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4477. Has
4477. Has there ever been any objection raised in your union to that system on the ground that it is throwing upon charitable persons a burden which ought properly to be borne by the poor rate?

We have to acknowledge that from the very commencement we have received the closest sympathy and co-operation from the workers among the poor, and especially the clergy. The clergy being largely represented upon the board of guardians, and being interested in the welfare of the poor, saw at once what the result of the system of relief as administered up to 1870 was; they saw how desirable it was to restrict legal relief. It was with their co-operation and with a perfect understanding with them, that we were enabled to apply this process of restriction; and we have had no representation and no complaint whatever from the clergy or from other workers.

4478. Are the funds by which this charity is supported derived principally from the people in the Whitechapel Union, or do they come from without?

Probably from both sources; I do not think I could say that they come from Whitechapel alone.

4479. Do you think that a large proportion comes from Whitechapel, or that Whitechapel, being a poor union, a large proportion is supplied by charitable subscriptions from those who are not in the union?

A large proportion, I should say, comes from Whitechapel alone.

4480. Will you state how you deal with widows who have children dependent upon them:

A widow with dependent children is first referred to the Charity Organization Society, the relieving officer being authorised to meet any circumstances of urgent necessity by relief in kind. In some cases, the society may succeed in introducing the widow to service, or employment, or may by the purchase of mangle or sewing machine, afford her the means of achieving independence, or—succeeding in part only—the society may refer the case back to the guardians with a request that one or more children may be admitted into the district school. It should also be stated that 36 poor widows are employed in the infirmary as washers and scrubbers at weekly wages. Thus we have been enabled to close the door of relief against these cases also.

4481. By that do you mean that you do not find it necessary to give any relief to widows?

I mean that the relief which the guardians would not hesitate to afford temporarily is rendered unnecessary by the intervention of organised charity.

4482. You are speaking, of course, of widows of respectable character?

Yes.

4483. So that the whole of the support of widows of respectable character in your union is thrown on charity?

Not the "support" so much as seeing to it that the poor woman is brought within reach of the friendship, the sympathy, the personal help, which will enable her to achieve independence.

4484. Do you adopt the system which obtains in one or two other unions, of taking some of the children and sending them to the district school?

We do.

4485. Do you find any objection on the part of the widows to that?

No; indeed, the more respectable the widow the more grateful she is, as a rule, for the offer of that form of relief. I may give as an illustration of the case of a poor woman, a very respectable widow, with four children applying for relief, and seeking the admission of two of her four children. When she was asked how she thought she would get along with her two remaining children, seeing that one was two years old and the other an infant, the poor woman with a smile of hope upon her face, having come in contact with helpful charity
charity before she entered the board room, said, "Well, I thought if the gentlemen would be good enough to take the two children into the school, I could get on nicely; my sister will take one of the children, and the ladies have been very kind, they have got a situation for me, and I am to have 187. a year, and the baby is to be near me." The consequence was that she not only came and applied for that relief, as the only form of relief, but accepted it gratefully. Knowing as we do what that self-respecting widow would have become if a dole of out-door relief had been granted, if she had mingled with the poor at the relief office for three months, if the relieving officer had been seen visiting her room every week or two, and she and the children had been the carriers of the relief to and fro, there can be but one conclusion, I think, in regard to the relative advantages of the two forms of relief.

4486. It is perhaps not quite correct, I think, to say as you did in answer to a question of mine that these widows are entirely dependent on charity, and receive nothing from the rates, because as a matter of fact the children who are taken to district schools of course are relieved at the expense of the rates.

I did not intend to convey that, since there are now 46 children of able-bodied widows maintained in the district school, chargeable to Whitechapel.

4487. Then I think I gather that your whole system is largely dependent upon the existence of these co-operating charitable societies?

The system is based upon a clear distinction being drawn between the function of legal relief and the function of voluntary charity.

4488. It is dependent upon charity in this sense, is it not: that without these charitable societies the system which prevails in Whitechapel could not be worked?

That is so; at all events to the extent of the practical abolition of out-door relief.

4489. Supposing that you had not such charitable societies should you be in favour of a strict administration, so that out-door relief should be granted only in very exceptional cases?

Only in exceptional cases and for a limited period. It is rather the hereditary pauperism and the permanent form of relief that we have set our faces against.

4490. Are you of opinion that the Prohibitory Order might be extended to London generally?

I am, the Regulation Order being reserved for periods of exceptional pressure.

4491. Have you had any exceptional distress in any winter in Whitechapel since you have adopted this plan?

I do not think I can say that there has been exceptional distress, except in the sense that the recurrent winter distress has been accentuated by special relief funds, and the attraction they offered to the poor to migrate from the country to London.

4492. Have you found that effect in Whitechapel itself?

Yes; there is no doubt whatever that the poor have been attracted to London by special relief funds.

4493. Have you any relief committees, or do the whole board deal with the cases that come before it?

We have never had relief committees; and to this fact, coupled with the unanimity which prevails at the board, I attribute the success of the system.

4494. Have you adopted any written or printed rules?

We have not.

4495. Have you not found on fresh elections to the board any difficulty with new guardians, in maintaining the consistency of your system?

As a fact we have not experienced difficulty, or possibly we might have sought for the arrangement of bye-laws, or rules for relief.
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4496. We may fairly conclude from that that the system is approved in the union by the ratepayers generally? I am quite satisfied that it is.

4497. Do you think that there has been any discontent upon the part of the poorer portion of the population at the strictness of your administration?
To the strict administration I attribute the content of the district. Under the old system, where it was a matter of discretion with the guardians whether they relieved or withheld relief, it created discontent if A. was relieved and B. was refused. But fixed rules having been laid down the poor understand them, and are guided by them.

4498. Will you now tell us shortly what has been the effect by these measures upon the pauperism in your union?
Taking as a starting-point the sixth week of the quarter ending at Lady-Day 1870, that being the week in which the highest pauperism in this union was reached, the following table will be found to show the number of paupers relieved, the ratio per cent. of in-door and out-door paupers, and the amount expended in out-door relief in that and the corresponding week of 1871 to 1888, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>In-door Paupers relieved</th>
<th>Out-door Paupers relieved</th>
<th>Total Number of Paupers relieved, exclusive of Lunatics in Asylums</th>
<th>Ratio per Cent.</th>
<th>Cost of Out-door Relief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-door.</td>
<td>Out-door.</td>
<td>£ s. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>5,389</td>
<td>6,798 (a)</td>
<td>21 (%)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>3,877</td>
<td>32 (%)</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>2,508</td>
<td>39 (%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>58 (%)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>65 (%)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>77 (%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>88 (%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>91 (%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>141 (c)</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>90 (%)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1,431 (b)</td>
<td>143 (c)</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>91 (%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1,464 (d)</td>
<td>128 (c)</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>92 (%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1,582 (e)</td>
<td>121 (c)</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>93 (%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1,478 (f)</td>
<td>105 (c)</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>93 (%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1,482 (b)</td>
<td>91 (c)</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>94 (%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1,418 (d)</td>
<td>77 (c)</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>95 (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1,370 (g)</td>
<td>74 (c)</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>95 (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1,205 (d)</td>
<td>70 (c)</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>95 (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1,247 (g)</td>
<td>61 (c)</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>95 (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1,050 (h)</td>
<td>63 (c)</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>95 (%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) The figures for 1870 may be regarded as exceptional to the extent of about 2,000 paupers, there being at that period a severe temporary pressure upon the administration; but it is nevertheless interesting to note that the experience of the winter of 1869–70 induced the guardians to voluntarily suspend the Out-door Relief Regulation Order early in the following year, and to apply strictly the principle of the Out-door Relief Prohibitory Order.
(b) Including 165 imbeciles at asylums in 1879, 162 in 1880, 159 in 1881, 152 in 1882, 140 in 1883, 135 in 1884, 130 in 1885, 126 in 1886. 127
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127 in 1887, and 127 in 1888, not classified as "Indoor Paupers" in previous years.

(c) These figures include 30 boarded-out children in 1878, 36 in 1879, 42 in 1880, 52 in 1881, 55 in 1882, 60 in 1883, 49 in 1884, 49 in 1885, 54 in 1886, 48 in 1887, and 41 in 1888.

4400. You have built, I think, a separate workhouse for your able-bodied and healthy infirm poor?

Yes.

4500. Is that in the nature of a labour-test house?

It is a workhouse for the healthy adult poor, whether infirm or able-bodied. It is a workhouse as distinguished from an infirmary, and as distinguished from a school.

4501. What labour are those who are able to work put to in the house?

The hardest work would be corn and coffee grinding. We have also wood-chopping, sawing and bundling for firewood, flour-dressing, mat-making, tin-working, smith-work, carpentering, coffin-making, furniture-making, brick-laying, whitewashing, painting, glazing, chimney-sweeping, shoemaking, tailoring, water-pumping, gardening, and so forth.

4502. Has any objection been raised to the sale of articles which are not for the workhouse itself, as interfering with outside labour?

The only articles that we have sold at all have been firewood (and that to a very small extent) and a few mats.

4503. In point of fact your labour is really almost entirely for purposes connected with the house itself?

Almost entirely.

4504. Has the financial result been good?

Yes; one cannot tabulate the financial results. By reason of the produce of that labour going into stock, and being a saving of trade labour from the outside, it would require a very careful calculation to ascertain what the precise value may be. We have never attempted any account of the labour at all.

4505. Have you never attempted to compare the cost of your workhouse with the employment of pauper labour exclusively with what the cost would be if you employed outside labour for many of these things?

I am afraid we could not make a calculation which would be of any great value. For instance, if we whitewash and paint a room, to form an estimate of what it would have cost had we put it into the hands of a tradesman to do would scarcely be a fair calculation, inasmuch as possibly we may now paint and whitewash a room where we should wait for awhile if we employed tradesmen. It is the same with other forms of work, and it would be very difficult to say what the exact cost would be.

4506. I understand that you have adopted some special system as regards the supervision of the paupers during the time that they are not employed; will you state what that system is?

In the evening hours we introduce mental instructors. The weakest point in workhouse administration is the more or less withdrawal of official supervision and restraint during the evening hours, i.e., the hours intervening between supper and going to bed; there being thus no check upon idle and vicious conduct and conversation. To remedy this state of things the guardians, in the early part of 1882, obtained the authority of the Local Government Board to enforce the attendance of the able-bodied male paupers in the dining hall of the workhouse during the interval between supper and the time for going to bed. The guardians thereupon appointed both a male and female "mental instructor" to attend at the workhouse each week-day evening, from half-past six till eight o'clock. The instructor, first of all, brings with him the daily newspapers, and takes advertisements, which he thinks may aid men in obtaining employment. He reads paragraphs and reports touching labour, emigration, providence, temperance.
temperance and kindred subjects, and endeavours to interest the men; and the female instructor does the same with the women. The result is, that it operates as a salutary restraint upon conversation and conduct during those hours. At the same time, where a man has any good in him at all, it is very helpful to him, and there is no doubt that it has had the effect of leading many to make another effort to achieve independence for themselves.

4507. Have you made provision for married couples?
We have provision for four married couples, but we have very seldom more than one room occupied, and not always that.

4508. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is that because deserving people are supported out of private charity, or on account of the reluctance of married people to live together under the circumstances?
It is because both, with the additional circumstance that where an aged married couple apply for relief, too frequently the man or woman is ill, requiring infirmary treatment and nursing, and consequently they are necessarily separated, but all married couples over 60 who enter the workhouse have a separate room assigned to them.

4509. Chairman.] How do you deal with the pauper children in your union?
Subject to a probationary stay in the workhouse, the Protestant children of the union are, for the most part, provided for in the Forest Gate District School (the Poplar and Whitechapel Unions being districted for the purpose), and the Roman Catholic and Hebrew children in certified schools under the Act 25 & 26 Vict., c. 43. In the cases of little orphan children under 10 years they are usually "boarded-out" in country homes under the Order of 25th November 1870. Boys who desire training for sea service are, if physically fitted, sent to the "Exmouth" training ship, which is under the management of the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

4510. What is the object of that probationary period where the children are orphans or deserted children?
As a precaution against the introduction of infectious diseases.

4511. Those who are orphans or deserted are transferred to a district school?
They are either transferred to a district school or a certified school, or they are boarded out.

4512. Do you board out many children?
We board out all children who come within the provisions of the Order, unless there are special circumstances, such as the existence of a brother or sister above age, or under age, where it appears undesirable to separate them.

4513. Are they boarded out at a distance from London under committees?
Under committees principally in Bedfordshire, Gloucestershire, Hertfordshire, Essex, and Surrey.

4514. Are you satisfied with the results?
I am generally satisfied with them, but it is a system which needs very careful supervision. I do not look upon it as a panacea for all the ills of pauper children. I think it needs very careful administration. At present the children who have been boarded out are those who would in the district school form the more permanent and hopeful class. Then we have also had an admirable selection of homes. So long as the homes are largely in excess of the children, committees are able to select the best foster parents for those children. The consequence is that they have had every facility and every advantage. But I may say that the cases which have been most successful are the cases of little girls.

4515. Have you any suggestion to make as to any better regulations which could be provided for securing that those children are well treated
I think
I think that the systematic inspection of children and homes is of the first importance, and there is no doubt whatever that the inspection which has been set on foot by the Local Government Board appointing a special inspector has had a very good effect upon committees and upon the children.

4516. Should you wish to see that inspection more frequent?

I think it is desirable that inspections should be moderately frequent. At the same time there is this to be said, that although the visits of the present lady inspector are infrequent—I am not quite sure whether she has been able to visit all the children in the kingdom—yet nevertheless, if there are any special circumstances which necessitate visitation, Miss Mason is always willing to make a special visit for us.

4517. Have you considered the case of those who are very commonly known as "ins and outs" of a workhouse; have you found much evil resulting from that?

We have not, I think, so many cases as they have in most unions. At the same time we have ha such cases and they are very difficult to deal with. At present we have a man and his wife who will insist upon running in and out of the workhouse, taking their children with them. We see this boy and girl evidently going wrong and the boy already shows vicious habits. Being registered as Roman Catholics, the children have now been transferred to Roman Catholic separate schools, notwithstanding their probable early discharge again. They were, however, no sooner placed there than the father gave notice of discharge; this was a few days since; and required his children brought to him. In reply, we said in effect: "Well, of course, you are entitled to the custody of the children, but as we have not an official staff to send down every day just when you happen to want the children, you had better go and seek work first, and then come back, and when you have got work we will see whether we can discharge the children to you;" so that we are throwing a difficulty of that sort in the way of the man taking the children in order to save them.

4518. It has been suggested to us that there should be some further power of detention lodged in the guardians, so that in the case of a pauper who had been several times in the course of a short period in and out of the workhouse, he might be detained even so long as a month; what do you think of that suggestion?

I think it is very desirable that the children of dissolute parents should be protected, even to the extent of withdrawing them from the custody and control of such parents. And whilst there is no doubt that parents are willing enough to get rid of the maintenance of their children, they are not willing to lose their entire custody and control; and if they knew that their children could be taken away from them, I am disposed to think that it would lead them to do their duty by their children, rather than neglect them.

4519. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You mean that during the years when the children are little they would get rid of them; but what they like is to reserve the power to reclaim the children at the time when they can earn money, or can be made useful?

That is so no doubt; but when I say that the legal custody should be withdrawn from a parent, I am of opinion that the legal custody being once transferred it should operate till the child is 20 or 21 years of age. My reason is that it is in the early days of work that the child wants more protection.

4520. Do I correctly understand you to reject the suggestion that habitual going in and out in this way, such as has been described to you, should be made to amount to a penal offence on the part of the parents?

I should be rather afraid of endowing the guardians with any general authority to withdraw the children of "ins-and-outs" from the custody of their parents.

4521. Only to be exercised in extreme cases?

Only in extreme cases by magisterial warrant.
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4522. Chairman]
4522. Chairman.] I asked you whether you thought that the Guardians should have the power to detain any pauper who is constantly in and out for a lengthened period, and you did not quite answer the question.

I think it is very desirable that the guardians should have increased powers of detention. The present condition of things has a most demoralizing effect, and more than that there is no doubt that it leads to vagrant habits.

4523. Returning to the case of the children whose legal custody you think might be taken away from their parents, might not this happen: that women with illegitimate children would be very glad indeed to get rid of their children by relinquishing the legal custody of them?

If the custody of a child is transferred from the parent, although a single woman, to the guardians, and the guardians are endowed with authority to emigrate that child, or otherwise to deal with it as in the case of a deserted child, I am disposed to think that the balance of probability would be that it would not operate to increase illegitimacy, or to increase the charge upon the rates. But beyond that I am strongly of opinion that something should be done to save the children, even at a little risk.

4524. Might there not be considerable risk that women of that class would habitually deposit their children in the custody of the public? Take the case of a woman, of whom I am sorry to say there are some of very abandoned habits, who had four or five illegitimate children, perhaps not by the same father, but not a woman of that kind, who comes perhaps into the workhouse habitually to lie in, be very ready to leave her children in the custody of other people?

And yet you see those four or five children being trained inevitably for the pauper ranks in the future; and the fact of her having to maintain those children is not operating to prevent her from bad causes.

4525. Lord Balfour of Barley.] It may operate to prevent some others though?

I am rather disposed to think that if the children are withdrawn from a dissolute parent the risk is compensated for, inasmuch as the guardians would have power to deal with the child as in the case of a deserted child, that is to say that the mother would possibly never see the child again; the child would be emigrated or otherwise transplanted for its own good.

4526. Chairman.] What would be the precise conditions which you would regard as being sufficient to warrant a magistrate in issuing such an order?

I presume the magistrate would have to satisfy himself that the child is in moral danger, that the parent is neglecting his, or her, natural duty, or is a person of vicious habit.

4527. Of course it is always easy to bring before a magistrate evidence of a satisfactory kind as to criminality; but would it not be very vague to say that a magistrate must satisfy himself that the parent was a person of vicious habits; what would be the definition of vicious habits?

I admit that there would be some difficulty in defining that, and I have never attempted to formulate any precise words which would meet it; but it would not be so difficult to show, by evidence of fact, that a child is in moral danger.

4528. You see that although there might be advantages in such an order being issued in particular cases, it would be somewhat difficult to frame a law which would have general application?

Yes. I may say that the form in which the guardians submitted their opinion to the Local Government Board was: "That legislation should be invoked in the larger direction of saving children from pauperism, crime, and immorality, by a more adequate provision than at present for the enforcement of parental responsibility, and, failing this, for securing the withdrawal of children from
the custody and control of vicious and negligent parents, and the endowment of guardians with power to emigrate such children, or otherwise to deal with them, as in the case of children deserted by their parents; and that, where the legal custody and control of a child may be withdrawn from a parent by magisterial warrant, the deprivation of right should be held to extend up to the age of twenty-one years, so as to afford the requisite protection to a child in the early years of work, and to secure the formation of good habits.”

4529. The proposal of the guardians there rests upon the enforcement of parental responsibility; how would you define the enforcement of parental responsibility; responsibility for what?

What was in the mind of the guardians at the time of the adoption of that resolution was that some such provision as exists in the State of Massachusetts was desirable, and that where a child by reason of the neglect, crime, drunkenness, or other vice of his parents, is growing up without education or salutary control, and in circumstances exposing him to lead an idle and dissolute life, certain legal results should follow, including the commitment of the child to the care of a public authority up to the age of 21.

4530. Would you apply that only where there was application for relief, or would you apply it generally to the whole population?

I should rather be disposed to apply it generally. It seems to me that the great means by which we are to stem the tide of pauperism and criminality is by dealing with the children.

4531. Then you would be prepared for the State undertaking the entire charge of all children whatsoever whose parents are of vicious habits?

Yes, but subject to contribution to their maintenance.

4532. With regard to the casual poor, have you any special regulations in Whitechapel as to their relief?

We have no special regulations. Our casual wards are associated wards; they were built before cellular wards were introduced. Consequently our casual poor relief is in the original form, which is to my mind very objectionable.

4533. Will you explain what change you would recommend?

I would recommend the abolition of the distinction between casual poor and ordinary poor. It is a distinction which cannot satisfactorily be made; there is no satisfactory means of defining what a casual poor person is. The separate form of relief originated at a time when the conditions of society were very different from what they are now; and we find now that a casual poor person is simply a person who happens to go to the casual ward for relief in lieu of going to the relief office. The same person may apply both to the relieving officer and the casual ward successively and be relieved. Beyond that it is operating injuriously. A casual poor person may in the first instance be merely a destitute poor person who wants to see a little possibility in the future; but when once he gets into the casual ward he deteriorates in character every night he seeks relief there; and the tendency of the system is to induce relieving officers and guardians to shift the burden of maintenance as far as possible from one union to another, so that these people may not become permanent paupers in one union. I think that inasmuch as a destitute poor person is entitled to relief by law in the place where he happens to be, that relief should be in one form. He claims relief on one ground—that of destitution; and it seems to me that the relief should be in one form in the workhouse. But inasmuch as relief in the workhouse to some extent is more eligible relief than in the casual ward, and as that may induce too great a reliance upon the rates, and the able-bodied poor might possibly become more and more addicted to vagrant habits, I think the provisions of the Pauper Inmates Discharge and Regulation Act should be extended so as to require a longer period of notice of discharge than at present exists. I think that the recommendation of Mr. Hedley in the last Report, that the present notice of 24 hours should be increased to seven days, that instead of 48 hours,
it should be 14 days, and instead of 72 hours that it should be 21 days, is a very moderate proposal, and that it would have the effect of stemming the tide of vagrancy.

4534. Should you leave a discretion with the master of the workhouse to discharge a man after one night, or at a shorter period, if he was in the master's opinion a bond fide wayfarer?

Clearly; I think that is most important. When the master sees that a man is an honest wayfarer, and that he has a bond fide object in passing through the town, and is on his way to another place, I say that the master might be properly endowed with discretion to discharge that man without a labor test, and with his breakfast in his hand, at an early hour in the morning, if he pleases; but that as at present the master should be required to report the facts in his journal.

4535. If you put an end to the separate treatment of what are now termed the casual poor, and dealt with the poor in the workhouses in the same manner as you dealt with the other poor, would not all those persons be removable to their place of settlement?

Yes; there is no doubt that they would be liable to that, but an inquiry into the place of settlement takes some time.

4536. Do you not think that the guardians would largely remove them in that case?

In very few of these cases would there be a settlement.

4537. Must not every man in England have a settlement?

Not a provable settlement. A large proportion of the poor in Whitechapel have no provable settlement; they are many of them removable poor whose settlements are not known and cannot be ascertained.

4538. Are they removable or irremovable?

They would be removable if their settlements could be found; but taking the birth settlement, which is the primary settlement; you have to prove not only the actual birth of John Williams in a certain place, but also his identity and that is where the difficulty is.

4539. There is a much simpler settlement than that in the present law, namely, three years' residence?

Yes, but there is a large class of poor who have not lived three years anywhere, or, if they have, it is very difficult to prove it. A man says: "I lived three years in a certain place," but there must be corroborative evidence of that; and if he has been wandering about amongst lodging-houses, and has simply been migrating from one place to another within a certain area, it is next to impossible to prove any settlement.

4540. So that you think that, in the large majority of cases, it would be found impossible to remove those persons?

In a very large number of cases it would.

4541. And you would leave them subject to the law of removal, like other paupers?

Yes, I would. At the same time I am disposed to think that, in the case of removals between Metropolitan Unions, the time has come when the law of removal might very well be abolished.

4542. You would modify the law of settlement so far as to make no distinction between the different parts of London, and let a man have a settlement in the whole of the metropolis?

Yes.

4543. That would, of course, be a considerable relief to the rural unions?

No, I do not think that it would.  

4544. What
4544. What I asked was whether you would give a man a settlement in London, for instance, who had resided anywhere for three years? I was rather pointing to the abolition of removal between one London union and another. If the provisions of the Pauper Inmates Discharge and Regulation Act were extended, there would, I think, be a sufficient restraint upon vagrant habits, whilst we should save a great deal of expense and litigation. At present removals are not compensated for by any results that follow. I am disposed to think that in London, at all events, the experiment might be tried of abolishing (or temporarily suspending) the law of settlement between the London unions; but of course if a pauper has a settlement in the country, the present law of settlement would operate, and the pauper would be liable to be removed.

4545. The case supposed is that a Whitechapel pauper has a settlement in St. George's, Hanover-square; you propose that the pauper would not be removable, but that would not affect a Whitechapel pauper who had a settlement in Bedfordshire?

Exactly.

4546. Speaking generally, do you think that the law of settlement and removal should be further modified, or are you satisfied with the three years residence, which is the latest provision?

I must confess that I am disappointed with the result of the law of 1876, the Divided Parishes Act. By that Act a simple form of settlement was created, but it has given rise to an amount of litigation which is very disappointing. The expense of contesting the legal points which have arisen has been very great, and looking to the fact that, as a rule, an able-bodied man is not sufficiently long chargeable to a union to come within the law of settlement and removal, I am led to make the suggestion that I made just now, that experimentally we might abolish or suspend the law of settlement and removal within the metropolis.

4547. I need hardly ask you whether you are in favour of relief works, such as have been set up in different parts of the metropolis?

I am not in favour of relief works.

4548. Do you think that such relief works operate as an attraction to the poor from outside?

I have no doubt of it.

4549. Have you remarked any unusual influx of agricultural labourers into your union during the last three or four years? The number of country poor who have become inmates of our workhouse has not been large. At the same time there was evidence of a considerable migration into London in the overcrowded state of the common lodging houses, and in the change of character of the persons resorting to the casual wards during the prevalence of special relief funds. I may say, too, that during the existence of the last Mansion House Fund, a country workhouse master informed me that he was besieged nightly by vagrants on their way to London.

4550. Have you any charitable refuges for casual poor in Whitechapel? We have a large refuge in Spitalfields, which is known as the Crispin-street Refuge.

4551. Does that work in conjunction with your board?

It does not.

4552. Would you not think it very desirable that it should do so? There is, no doubt, that by co-operation it might be made useful, rather than demoralising, as, no doubt, it is by the way in which relief is afforded.

4553. We have had evidence that a system of this kind has been practised in one part of London, namely, that these applicants for casual relief who
appear to the workhouse authorities to be likely to be deserving of charitable assistance are sent to the refuges if they are willing to go, that at these refuges inquiry is made with regard to them, and if possible they are by charitable assistance put into the way of obtaining permanent work; do you not think that some system of that kind is very desirable as sitting out from among the mere vagrants the men who would work if they could obtain work?

Possibly something in that direction might with advantage be arranged.

4554. Whilst you are a strong advocate for charitable organization and charitable assistance to what we may term the deserving poor, does it not occur to you that a great deal of evil results from indiscriminate charity in London?

There is no doubt of that.

4555. And that it tends to create pauperism?

Yes.

4556. And it must also have the effect of attracting people from the country to a considerable extent, who are afterwards possibly thrown upon the rates?

Undoubtedly.

4557. Is there any other point upon which I have not asked you as to which you would like to give evidence?

Upon the question of out-door relief I should like to say that I think that would assist the boards of guardians throughout the kingdom, and that it would be likely to bring about a sounder administration of relief if the guardians were encouraged to adopt bye-laws of relief. In Whitechapel we have not adopted anything of the sort, for the reason that there has been no necessity for it. At the same time, in Manchester, I believe, and other places, they have bye-laws relating to relief. But if the guardians were encouraged to prepare bye-laws, with the sanction of the Local Government Board, I think it would be a considerable help in the direction of restricting the out-door relief which is now given so lavishly in many unions.

4558. Whilst quite agreeing with you, as I do, that some definite rules are a great assistance in the administration of relief by a board, do you feel quite satisfied that it would be desirable that those rules should be submitted to the Local Government Board; would not that be apt very much to reduce everything to certain cast-iron rules not applicable to every particular locality?

If they were submitted to Local Government Board I do not think that it would necessarily follow that greater restraint would be imposed, but that within existing limits of discretion, guardians might further restrict themselves by rules. If some such suggestion was prefaced by a Minute of the Local Government Board re-affirming the principles which were laid down in the year 1834, I think that the result would be a considerable diminution in the out-door relief lists in many unions.

4559. Whilst fully admitting the advantage and the necessity for central control of poor law administration, do you think it desirable that that control should be drawn very tight?

I was looking upon it as being an alternative, and that rather than the Local Government Board should initiate legislation with a view to tying the hands of the guardians completely, the guardians should within distinct limits place their own restrictions upon relief.

4560. It might be provided that such rules should not be altered by any chance vote of the Board, but that there should be some special notice and special mode in which they should be altered, so that they might have a certain amount of permanency?

I should say that they ought to have a considerable amount of permanency.

4561. Earl of Aberdeen. I infer from your last answer but one, that you would not be in favour of any extension of what may be called the central control
control or control from a central authority, but rather that you would indirectly encourage action on the part of the guardians, merely reserving a general supervision on the part of the Local Government Board:

I would encourage the guardians to fall back upon the principles of administration which were so clearly laid down in 1834, and that out-door relief should be made the exception and not the rule. It seems to me that the better way to do that would be to lead guardians to lay down their own rules, and to study the question in the abstract before receiving their applications for relief rather than that legislation should be initiated, and a drastic measure of prohibition passed.

4562. Do you consider that there is a gradual improvement going on with regard to the administration of the poor laws, and a corresponding check upon the indiscriminate charity which does so much harm?

My impression is that there is an improvement, and that there has been a gradual improvement for some considerable time past.

4563. Do you think that we may hope to see the time when the public, as a whole, would feel confidence that any individual whom they may meet begging, either mutely or by a spoken appeal, may be safely dismissed as one who would be dealt with properly?

I think so.

4564. But there is not that impression on the part of the public as yet, is there?

What gives rise to the discontent and dissatisfaction amongst the public is the want of rule and of system. If a system of poor law administration is in force in a given union, and it is understood that certain rules are adhered to, and that exceptional distress is met in a certain way, and that the out-of-work cases are dealt with in a certain way, and it is clearly understood that no case of destitution can arise without its coming within the purview of the poor law, then it seems to me that confidence is being restored. I feel that public opinion in Whitechapel is coming round to a general approval of our administration within that district, and that has arisen from seeing the way in which the poor are dealt with. They are dealt with by the guardians strictly and uniformly, and yet there is considerable individualisation. The poor understand fixed rules; charity is free and well considered, and so the poor are not neglected.

4565. But I suppose you would agree that a large amount of indiscriminate charity which goes on over London for instance, as a whole, is partly produced by an impression that the destitute are not certain in many cases of being adequately dealt with from Poor Law sources?

There is no doubt that there is that impression.

4566. Of course if you could remove that impression, the indiscriminate charity would correspondingly be diminished, would it not?

I am afraid that it would be difficult altogether to stop indiscriminate charity on the part of individuals. At the same time there is, I think, a growing desire on the part of the charitable public to be discriminating in their administration of alms, and to secure counsel and concert with other agencies.

4567. Of course there must always be people who are impressionable and anxious to relieve any appearance of distress; but the public would support stricter police rules, would they not, as regards mendicancy, if there was a general confidence as to the administration in that direction you point to?

There would be less excuse for mendicancy if we could get the distinction abolished between the casual poor and others; and if it was generally known that there is a workhouse where the poor are humanely treated, and where proper security is taken against their becoming vagrant in habit, I think there would be a growing confidence on the part of the public, and they would be able largely to suppress mendicancy.

4568. When you speak of relief works, do you include such operations as those which were carried on by the vestry of Chelsea a couple of years ago?
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I do.
I do. In the case of Chelsea, as I understand that experiment, the local authority expended some 10,000 l. in the relaying of King’s-road. The paving was undoubtedly in bad condition, but if I am rightly informed, in the ordinary course of events the road would not have been repaved for a year or two. The result was that, during a season of apparent distress, the unemployed were engaged, before the work was really necessary, in taking up and relaying this road, and 10,000 l. was borrowed, and a future generation taxed for the 10,000 l., whilst the independent labourer at a future time will be deprived of his labour. It seems to me like drawing a bill upon a future generation for the relief of the present unemployed, and I very much question whether it was not really an injury to the poor. Undoubtedly it put wages into the hands of a certain number of men at that particular time, but the ultimate result must, I think, be injurious.

4569. You think that if it had been tried on a more extended scale the drawbacks would have been more apparent than they were?

Possibly.

4570. In your experience is it not the case that vicious parents although they may be quite willing to get rid of their children when they are very young, are generally anxious to get them under their control again when they are old enough to help them to earn money by begging, or in other ways?

Unquestionably so.

4571. Would not that probably meet the difficulty which is apprehended with regard to such parents wishing to rid themselves of their children; I mean that if on their claiming their children again they were compelled to pay a rate in proportion to the time such children had been maintained, it would be a check upon their obtaining them again?

Yes, there is no doubt that that would be so; but beyond that I think that when once the custody of the child is transferred to the guardians, the guardians should have power to deal with the child and the parent should renounce all claim to it.

4572. There would still be the difficulty that the State would be relieving the parents of their natural duty to maintain the child?

Yes; but at the same time we should be doing something to prevent the continuance of another generation of paupers.

4573. You think that in that way there would be a balance even in the matter of expense, by saving so many children from pauperism?

I think so.

4574. With regard to the difficulty concerning the power of the magistrate to decide who are vicious parents, would you consider that such an arrangement, if carried out, would merely form a part, though no doubt an extension, of the discretion which at present is vested in magistrates? For example, a magistrate often has to decide whether a young offender should be sent to a reformatory or to a prison, which may be a very important distinction; would you consider that under the proposed arrangement the magistrates would have the discretion given to them to deal, upon the evidence, with the question of vicious parents?

I think so. When a magistrate is of opinion that it is clearly to the interest of a child, having regard to the conduct and antecedents of the parents, that the custody of the child should be transferred to a public authority, then he would have power given him by Statute to make a formal transfer.

4575. There would, of course, be an appeal provided?

Yes.

4576. Have you in your official experience met with cases of systematic cruelty to children on the part of parents?

There have been no cases that we have proceeded against, although there have undoubtedly been cases of cruelty. But let the poor be as depraved as they
they may be, there is yet a certain amount of affection which they have for their offspring.

4577. I was alluding rather to special cases, where there has been evidence brought out of systematic cruelty of almost incredible kinds?
I have not had such cases within the range of my experience.

4578. The guardians or their officers have no power, have they, to interpose in such cases unless a complaint of want of maintenance is brought before them?
Where a child under the age of 14 is deprived of sufficient food, clothing, medical attendance, or lodging, the guardians may interpose and proceed against the parent or other person having the custody of that child?

4579. Have any such cases come under your notice?
I have had no case brought under my official notice, but there have been such cases.

4580. Perhaps you are aware that, owing to the operations of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, most startling cases have been brought to light where children have been practically starved, although the parents have been perfectly well able to feed them?
I am.

4581. Earl of Strafford.] Was the distress last winter in your union more severe, or less severe, than it was in the preceding winter?
Our numbers were somewhat larger last winter than in the preceding winter, but it is difficult to say whether there existed more distress or not. There is no doubt that there is an immense amount of chronic distress which it is next to impossible to cope with, either by Poor Law or charity, and that distress is increased by the immigration of the poor from different parts of the kingdom into London.

4582. And with the assistance of charitable institutions you were able to grapple successfully with the distress which came before you last winter?
I consider that we were.

4583. Earl of Miltown.] In unions which are not so fortunately situated as yours appears to be in having an admirable system of charitable relief, are you in favour of the maintenance of a modified system of out-door relief?
With regard to relief in the cases of the sick, widows, and the aged, I should not be prepared in the event of there being no organisation of charity, or no means of providing for deserving cases, to advocate the entire abolition at once of out-door relief. I should say that in the case of the sick, relief in any case should be made educational, and that it should be conditional upon his entering a sick club. In the case of widows, in some few instances it would be necessary to give, for a temporary period, out-door relief upon a liberal scale; but as a rule it would not be necessary to resort to out-door relief as a permanency, it being preferable to admit a portion of the family into the district school. In the case of the aged and infirm, which is one of the most difficult classes to deal with, where you find that a man is absolutely destitute from no fault of his own, having lived an honest life, it would be very difficult to refuse relief in every case, assuming that no charity was available. With regard to the modified out-relief order, which was issued a year or two back to White-chapel, that, I think, in conjunction with the Regulation Order, should be reserved by the Local Government Board for periods of exceptional pressure; and under ordinary circumstances out-of-work cases should be relieved in the workhouse under the Prohibitory Order.

4584. I understand you to object altogether to the present system by which casuals are relieved?
Yes.
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4585. But
4585. But supposing it to continue as it is for some time longer should you be in favour, as has been suggested to us by one witness, of the admission to the casual ward being earlier in the day, if application should be made, and the test work being then applied, and the casual as a rule being permitted to leave at a very early hour the next morning in order to obtain work?

Our practice is now to allow a casual to leave very early in the morning. When he is discharged he leaves at half-past six o'clock, or even earlier if he desires.

4586. We have been told that the rule is that they are not to leave until nine o'clock, unless under exceptional circumstances?

All our male casuals are discharged by half-past six o'clock.

4587. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Lord Milltown's objection is this: that if a casual comes in in the middle of a day he does not do his task that day and go off to seek work the next morning; at present you keep the casual two nights, do you not?

Yes.

4588. What do you say to the other suggestion?

I am not quite sure how it is going to operate.

4589. Earl of Milltown.] In the case of a man who could get bond fide work, if he were allowed to go out of the workhouse it seems very unreasonable to keep him in the workhouse against his will, and so make him lose his work?

Even now, if a man shows that he is a bond fide wayfarer, he is allowed to go out without having done any work at all. The superintendent of the casual ward is endowed with discretion in regard to such cases.

4590. And that you think is sufficient?

Yes.

4591. In that case he is not called upon to do any work and may take his discharge the next morning?

Yes, in such a case.

4592. Before six o'clock?

If he desires it, but otherwise at half-past six.

4593. Otherwise you would prefer that they should be detained for seven days, as a rule?

In the workhouse. If you detain a man seven days in a workhouse, and put him to useful labour at his own trade, relying upon dissociation throughout the whole day for discipline, and withholding anything in the way of bribe for extra work as long as he is in the workhouse, it seems to me that then your workhouse arrangements are sufficiently deterrent and at the same time the man is being educated to labour, and he is not losing the power of labour. At present, under the casual ward system, in Whitechapel for instance, where we have an associated ward, the only form of labour that is possible is oakum picking. Oakum picking in association has a most demoralising effect upon the casuals. When a casual has spent a few days at such labour he becomes a casual in nature, and it is next to impossible to get him on to his feet again.

4594. Besides, it is extremely unequal in its incidence, is it not?

Extremely unequal.

4595. Chairman.] Would it not be necessary to employ those men as a rule quite separately from the other paupers, because the class to which they belong is such that it would be a grievance and an injury to mix them with the ordinary paupers?

My experience is that there is little or no distinction to be made between those casuals and the ordinary habitues of a workhouse; 50 per cent. of the men who have been in our workhouse have at some time or other been in a casual ward.

4596. That would apply in a London union; but in a rural union would there
there not be a greater distinction between the agricultural labourer who is a pauper and the wandering vagrant? Undoubtedly; but the vagrant life which has been engendered is, I feel, largely the result of the vagrant system of relief.

4597. Earl Spencer.] There are one or two questions which I should like to ask you about the children who are sent to school. I gather that you send the greater portion of your children to the district schools?

Yes.

4598. Do you consider that the education that they get at the district schools is quite satisfactory?

I think so; I have not formed any adverse opinion.

4599. I am rather comparing it now with the boarding-out system. We have heard from some witnesses (I am not giving it as my own opinion) that the children in the district school get rather dulled in their intellect, that no individual education is given to them, that they are all numbered and so on, and that has a bad effect in numbing their intellect and intelligence; do you concur in that opinion?

I do not think it can be said that children are numbered. There is no doubt that in district schools there is not the same individualisation that there is in a cottage home. At the same time the earnest endeavour of the managers is to make the administration as individual as it can possibly be made. In the case of the boys their mode of training to handicrafts, in music, and so on, tend to bring this out. In the case of the girls we have a domestic training class which is quite a new departure in district schools. The girls of this class have money placed in their hands, and they go to market and purchase their own provisions. They are excepted from the ordinary dietary; they are trained to wait at table; they have separate apartments, and they are trained for some two or three months for actual service, mixing with outside people, learning the value of money, making up accounts, and studying domestic economy. All this affords training and all tends to develop their intelligence, and that is what is being done at the Forest Gate school with very great success.

4600. Is the Forest Gate school one of those schools which is under cottage management, or with a foster mother and father over a cottage?

No; it is one of the first district schools.

4601. You think, of course, that there is a great improvement in the management of the children there as compared with what it used to be in the workhouse?

Unquestionably.

4602. And do you not feel the same objection to it that some of the witnesses have expressed?

There is no doubt that boarding out in many cases has a great advantage, especially in the case of little girls. When you come to older children, and especially boys, there is not the same advantage in boarding out; they do not respond to the cottage influence in the same way as little girls do; they require the discipline of an institution and the supervision of a master. We have had several cases in Whitechapel where boys have become unmanageable and have been returned to us. In those cases it is probable that had those boys been brought up in the district school they would have succeeded. I am not saying a word against the boarding-out system; I only say that it is specially adapted to certain cases.

4603. You think that it is more adapted to girls than to boys?

I do.

4604. And you consider that in the case of boys there is some advantage in the discipline which they get in the district school, and in the trades which they learn?

That is clearly my opinion.
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4605. With
4605. With regard to girls, are you in favour of very much extending the system of boarding out, and, in fact, of taking nearly all those who are now in district schools and sending them to the country?

I do not think it can be much extended, though I should be disposed to extend it below and beyond the present ages where there is a brother or sister boarded out. If there is a child of a boarding-out age, and there is no general objection to another child over ten, or to an infant under two years of age, being boarded out, I should be disposed to relax the rule so that the children might all go together.

4606. What is the age up to which you keep children at these schools?

Technically until they are 16 years old; practically we have in Forest Gate very few children over the age of 13.

4607. What do you do with them when they leave the school at that early age?

The girls go into service. The boys, having largely passed through the band, go into bands of the Army, or they are transferred to the training ship, or, where there is no other means open, they are sent to Homes for Working Boys in London, or to the House Boy Brigade, and in that way they are put in the way of getting their own living. I may say that in Whitechapel we have now for many years discontinued the system of apprenticing boys.

4608. I will ask you a question or two about the children of vicious parents; you are aware that the law distinguishes between different schools; there are the reformatories, which deal with the children who have been actually guilty of some offence against the law; and there are the industrial schools, where the children have not been convicted of any actual offence; with regard to the industrial schools, you probably know the sections which refer to the committal of children?

I do.

4609. You are aware that you can send to those schools children that have been begging or selling articles in the public street, or wandering from house to house without proper guardianship or visible means of subsistence, or found destitute, either being orphans or having a surviving parent undergoing penal servitude, or children that frequent the company of reputed thieves, and I think later on there is a further section which provides that any child who is found living with a common or reputed prostitute, or in a house frequented for the purpose of prostitution; those are all very clear definitions; how would you extend those definitions so as to clearly exclude the children of vicious parents?

I have not attempted at all to further define it; I have merely dealt with it in the abstract and in general terms.

4610. I think that a refractory child in a workhouse even can be sent to an industrial school?

Yes.

4611. But you would like to extend it still further?

I was rather expressing my opinion in general terms, that where children are neglected by their parents or where their parents are failing in their duty to them, and where the children are growing up without education or salutary control, and in circumstances exposing them to lead an idle and dissolute life, there should be some legal provision for transferring the children to the custody of the guardians or some public authority for the purpose of saving them; that we should do something to prevent pauperism as well as to deal with it.

4612. The Industrial Schools Act is an attempt of that sort, is it not?

There is no doubt that the Industrial Schools Act does deal with it to a certain extent.

4613. The children cannot be detained after the age of 16, I think?

No.

4614. Would
4614. Would you in the endeavour to deal with the children of vicious parents extend the age beyond 16?
I think it is of very great importance that it should be extended beyond the age of 16. Although the earnings of the child would be its own, yet the mother or father of a child has a great influence over a child of that age, and cases frequently occur where a girl has been placed out in service, and the deserting or neglecting parent has turned up when the child is 16 or 17 years old, has found out the child, has got the child's earnings, and generally asserted authority over her. It is rather to avoid that and to secure the influence of the controlling authority that I should be disposed to see the age extended.

4615. You would even be disposed to extend the Industrial Schools Act in that respect?
I would not speak too positively as to that, because I have had very little experience of the working of that Act.

4616. When you speak of out-door relief, do you include in that medical relief?
No, I do not. In speaking of out-door relief I was speaking of relief in money and kind.

4617. What is your opinion with regard to out-door medical relief?
There is no doubt that out-door medical relief is too frequently the introduction to pauperism. At the same time the responsibility of the relieving officer is such as to induce extreme care in refusing such relief. In Whitechapel, the rule is to give the order for medical relief upon application without waiting for investigation, the relieving officer visiting as soon as may be after the granting of the order, and if he finds that he has been in any way deceived, or that the circumstances are not such as he anticipated from the original statement, he will either cancel the order or bring the facts before the guardians. Although the guardians have not legally any power to declare such relief to be upon loan, or, at all events, it is open to considerable doubt, yet in practice we do declare such relief upon loan, and it operates to deter applicants.

4618. Do you get back the money?
We get some of it back, but not to any large extent. Where we do get it back it is rather through the persistency of the collector, who is known in the courts and alleys.

4619. In these tables that you have handed in does the column of out-door relief include those receiving out-door medical relief?
No, they do not.

4620. Have you any table or figures to show what number of persons receive out-door or medical relief?
No; but I may say that they are comparatively few. On any one day probably from 20 to 30 would represent the number.

4621. Do you know at all what the annual cost of out-door medical relief is in your union?
The cost is merely nominal, over and above the medical officer's salary.

4622. But do you not give medical extras?
Very few.

4623. You do not give wine or meat?
No; they are very rarely given. If the patient requires these medical extras the medical officer is invariably of opinion that infirmary treatment is better for him. But in some cases the person may be so ill that he cannot be removed to the infirmary, and then both medical extras and food would be required, and it is the duty of the medical officer to secure adequate relief for the case.

4624. There has not been any abuse of the granting of alcohol in the shape of medical relief?
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Not at all. I do not suppose that the medical extras in wine and nourishment in the course of a quarter would amount to £1.

4625. Have you medical clubs in your district?
Yes, there are some; but I am disposed to think they are very little resorted to.

4626. How is it that there are so few of these clubs?
It has not become a habit amongst the poor; I do not know in what way otherwise to explain it. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that there are no medical clubs worth mentioning.

4627. Chairman.] May it not be that there are such great facilities for obtaining medical relief that that discourages the existence of these clubs?
There is no doubt that that is very much the case.

4628. Earl Spencer.] They get their medical relief either from the Poor Law or from the hospitals?
Very many of the poor get their medical relief from the public hospitals, one large hospital (the London) being within the Whitechapel Union. But it should be explained that there are also within the union at least two free dispensers, and that some medical practitioners living among the poor adopt club rules and receive payment of weekly sums in, or to provide for sickness.

4629. Lord Thring.] When you talk of removing children from the care of their parents, I understand you always to intend that the parents shall be compelled by the State to contribute to the maintenance of the children.
Quite so.

4630. And that you would consider to be an essential condition?
Most important.

4631. Indiscriminate relief is no doubt a great evil; and, as you have said, well-ordered charity, in addition to well-ordered Poor Law relief, is probably sufficient for the relief of all preventible distress; but I want to ask you this practical question: Supposing that in Whitechapel a man or a woman appealed to you for assistance, what would you say to her or to him? would you say, "Go to the relieving officer," or would you say, "Go to charity"?
Do you mean if a poor woman is destitute and asks for advice as to what she shall do?

4632. What I meant was, supposing that she was a beggar and comes to you in Whitechapel, and asks you for alms; you are unwilling, as so many people are, to refuse to give alms unless you are certain that she can get relief; what practical answer would you give her?
I should ask her, "Are you destitute? Have you no food to eat and no roof to cover you?"

4633. Supposing she said "Yes," what would you do?
I should say, "If you are destitute, you had better apply to the relieving officer." The duty of the relieving officer is to meet the claims of destitution.

4634. We should entirely destroy indiscriminate charity, in my opinion, if we furnished people with a sufficient practical answer when a beggar appeals to them, so that they could tell him where to go and what he would get, and might be certain that he would get either charity, where charity is required, or Poor Law relief where charity is not applicable. What formula would you suggest for the purpose of conveying that to the minds of people that beg, as they do of me at Kensington almost every day now?
Of course you must adopt one of two courses; you must either say, "Here is a ticket; with that ticket you can go to the offices of the Charity Organisation Society, and have your case inquired into," or if he is absolutely destitute, 'You had better go to the relieving officer; the law has provided relief for you in the workhouse."

4635. The proper way is to provide persons with tickets for the Charity Organisation
Organisation Society, and then to say to them, "Take your choice; go to one or the other"?

Yes.

4636. But without those tickets you have not got a sufficient answer, have you; do you think it is enough to say to a person, "Go to the relieving officer"?

I think that is enough; if a person begs alms by reason of destitution I look upon it that it is the proper answer to say, "Go to the relieving officer; the law has provided relief for your destitution." The relieving officer, acting in concert with charity, asks his questions, and satisfies himself possibly that it is a case where the poor person has never been in a workhouse before that, and that some exceptional circumstances may have occasioned his destitution. In that case he would himself send a note of reference to the Charity Organisation Society, and ask them to be good enough to favour him with a reply upon which he would admit or otherwise.

4637. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You have handed in a table showing your statistics of pauperism from the year 1869; there was a considerable change in the law in 1870, putting certain charges upon the Common Fund; how far do you think that change in the law has had an influence upon the facts brought out in your tables?

The Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867, of course made a considerable change in the law, but it was not for several years after that the Amendment Act was passed which brought the in-door poor within the provisions of that Act. The fivepence a-day which is now a claim upon the Metropolitan Poor Fund was not in the original Act but in the Amending Act. There is no doubt that it has operated to some extent to the diminution of out-door relief. At the same time I am not disposed to attach so much weight to it as is generally done. I know as regards my own Board that the question as to whether this or that is a charge upon the Common Poor Fund or not is a question which never arises at all and never influences the decision.

4638. What is the date of the Amending Act which you mention?

Twentieth June, 1870.

4639. You claim for your system of administration that it has operated independently of that Act, and that it would have in all probability operated if that Act had not been passed?

I do. I may say that it was the abuses of the Out-door Relief Regulation Order which led the guardians to reconsider their position in the first instance, and it was not the result of legislation at all.

4640. At the same time, in instituting any comparison between in-door and out-door relief as it exists in the metropolis, and as it exists in districts outside London, it is impossible to leave that Act out of consideration, is it not?

Yes, it is correct to say that.

4641. Have you anything to say as regards the policy of that Act?

There is no doubt that when that Act was passed in order to relieve the poor districts overburdened with their pauperism, it was necessary to do something by means of legislation. At the same time it is to be borne in mind that the funds which are brought together under the Metropolitan Poor Act are contributed by the various unions, and that the expenditure is largely uncontrolled by those who pay. For instance, we in Whitechapel may administer very strictly indeed, and we may be doing our utmost to dispauperise; but another union may be adopting another course; they may be lax in their administration and fostering pauperism. Consequently we, as a strict union, are contributing to the expenses of the laxly administered union. In other words representation and taxation do not go together.

4642. To that limited extent, especially if the policy of the Act were extended further, you would feel the want of due and necessary control over expenditure?

I should.

(70.)
4643. It is of the utmost importance to those who are administering the law, and to their constituents, to have present to their minds that they must pay for the luxury of a lax administration, if they choose to adopt it.

That is the way in which I regard it.

4644. You have had, I think, before your board of guardians, a scheme for agricultural training homes upon the initiation of Mr. Barnett?

Yes.

4645. Do you regard that as a practical scheme?

I am not prepared at present to say that it is. Personally, I have taken interest in it to this extent; that I feel that a proposal of this kind, which it is supposed will have the effect of getting the people back from the towns on to the land, of bringing the land into cultivation, and of training men for agricultural life, is a step in the right direction. And beyond that, I feel that it is very desirable that boards of guardians should be the first to take up questions of this kind, and thrash them out and see whether there is anything in them. At present the position which the Whitechapel Board have taken with regard to this question, has been that the want of workhouse accommodation must necessarily be a condition precedent to the formulation of a practicable scheme, and that inasmuch as we have already ample workhouse accommodation, we were unable to consider the question ourselves. But finding that in some parts of London there was an insufficiency of workhouse accommodation at times, it was thought well that the guardians of London should be asked to consider the question. We have accordingly invited the guardians of London to confer upon the matter, and a conference has been arranged. With regard to the proposal itself, I have really nothing to say; I have not yet been able to form an opinion upon it.

4646. Have you any hope that any proposal of that kind would do more than relieve a mere fraction of the people with whom you have to deal?

I fear that there is too much probability that that is so. At the same time, if I understand rightly, the "scheme" is not intended to be more than suggestive of a direction of effort either by poor law, or charity, or both in concert.

4647. Are there any number who physically or by previous training are in any way fitted for the rough work of the country, such as they would have to undertake in that class of house?

Assuming that we are getting a large immigration from the agricultural districts into London, and that it is impossible to find work for those men, and if it is found practicable to get those men back on to the land, and to resume their habit of work in such a way as to be fitted for emigration, or otherwise, something might possibly be done, whether by the Poor Law or by voluntary effort will be a difficult question to determine.

4648. You have just said, "If we are getting a migration of people from the country," and, "if it is possible to put them back again;" is it your opinion that either of those "ifs" represent the state of the case?

I think there is a migration going on.

4649. To the East End of London?

Yes, into the east of London.

4650. Where do you think it is coming from?

There has been for several years an increase in the country element amongst our poor.

4651. Where do you meet them?

Among the applicants for relief, and especially in the casual ward; that is where many of them gravitate to. The superintendent of the casual ward tells me that the class of poor periodically change, that is to say, that during certain months of the year there is a larger proportion of countrymen than at others. At other times the casuals are solely London vagrants.

4652. Can
4652. Can you discriminate between one time of the year, and the other, when you notice country people?

There are more country people relieved in the casual ward in summer months, than in winter.

4653. Is the expression of opinion which you have just given that at times there is a larger influx of country people than at others founded upon observations of your own, or is it founded upon any inquiries made as to where people come from?

It is founded upon observations of our own in the casual ward.

4654. You have no notes or figures to which you could appeal which would show that in such and such a year there was a certain proportion of those who seemed to be fresh from the country, and that in such another year there was another proportion?

I have not tabulated any facts bearing upon the question.

4655. Are you confident that the expression of opinion which you have given is really founded upon the fact that there is a substantial migration from the country to London?

I have been led to the conclusion that there has been a considerable immigration; but I am not able to speak with any positiveness as to its extent.

4656. Have you any opinion to express upon the policy of either the boards of guardians or the vestries starting a system of relief works in the winter to relieve those who are apt to represent themselves as unemployed?

I do not think that relief works afford any permanent relief of distress; but I think they rather tend to make the condition of the poor worse.

4657. We had before us the other day a member of the board of guardians of Marylebone, who was asked on the question of the policy of taking one or two children from widows who have more children than they can support, and putting them into the district school; or, as a counter policy, supporting the woman by means of out-door relief, leaving the children under her charge. He expressed an opinion in favour of leaving the children with their mother and giving her relief; and these questions were put, and these answers were given.

"(Q.) Do you think that there is any difference with regard to the two systems in discouraging or otherwise applications for relief?—(A.) I think not. (Q.) You think on the whole that there would be as many widows probably asking for and requiring relief under the one system as under the other?—(A.) Quite so. (Q.) So that the two systems must be judged not on the question of whether one or the other tends to discourage pauperism, but rather upon the question of whether the one or the other is the best for the children?—(A.) Quite so.

As an inducement I do not think it is very material; I consider that it does not affect the cases very much." Is that in accordance or not with your experience?

It is not in accordance with my experience. On the contrary, the present number of children of widows in the district schools is 46, and that is to be compared with a mean number of 418 widows, and 1,110 children in receipt of out-door relief in 1870.

4658. And the policy of taking the children from the widows and supporting them in the district school has been uniformly but gradually brought into practice since the first Act which you have mentioned?

Quite so.

4659. Are the conditions of the district in any way materially changed so as to account for the change of numbers which you have given?

Not materially. There have been certain demolitions of property carried on in the district under the Arizans' Dwellings Act; and there is no doubt that that has caused some change in the district; but I do not consider that there has been a material change; that is to say, that I do not think they have migrated in any numbers to any other district, or we should have had them returned to us under orders of removal.
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4660. Would
4660. Would you be in favour of such a change of the law as would undoubtedly give the guardians the right to recover the out-door medical relief which they give, when they are of opinion that the circumstances of the person to whom it is given on emergency warrant their taking that course?

I think it would be a great advantage if the guardians had the power to declare medical relief to be by way of loan.

4661. I mean without the consent of the person to whom the relief is given?

I do not regard the consent of the person to whom it is given as being necessary under any circumstances.

4662. [Chairman.] The general view, however, is that unless the person has consented the loan cannot be recovered?

I do not consider that it is necessary that the pauper should consent to enable the guardians to declare and to enforce repayment of the loan.

4663. Has there ever been any legal decision whatever which affirms that view?

I have recovered in a great many cases relief without such consent in the county courts in the country.

4664. Lord Balfour of Burley.] But assuming that there was any doubt cast upon it, or even assuming that the law was declared adverse to what you suggest, as it probably is at the present time, would you be in favour of the doubt being removed, and of the question of law being put beyond doubt the other way?

I have not heard a doubt expressed before; but if there should be a doubt of course it would be well that it should be removed.

4665. And you think that could be done in many cases without any injustice at all to those who at present get medical relief at the expense of the ratepayers?

It is a form of relief which is necessarily open to abuse. The relieving officer will not accept, and I am of opinion that he is not justified in accepting, the responsibility of refusing; and the relieving officers in Whitechapel acting upon my advice rarely refuse an application for medical relief; but as soon as possible after the grant of the order they follow it up.

4666. At the same time you are convinced that in that matter you are habitually and deliberately imposed upon in numerous instances?

There is no doubt of it.

4667. And that the people deliberately take advantage of that position for the purpose of imposing upon the ratepayers, and getting relief?

Precisely.

4668. [Chairman.] I conclude that your relieving officer would not grant an order for medical relief in a case in which he had obvious means of knowing that the persons were perfectly able to pay for it themselves?

Clearly not. I meant that he would not wait to visit and to make his investigation, but that he would simply receive the application and deal with the circumstances as they then appeared to him, and if it was alleged by the applicant that he had not the means the relieving officer would not take the responsibility of refusing.

4669. Not if he was perfectly convinced that the allegation was untrue?

If he was perfectly convinced that it was untrue, and he had the facts before him to justify him, he would of course refuse.

4670. With regard to the question of treating it as a loan do you make the assertion that if a man applies for relief, and it is a fit case for relief, and you admit that he must have relief from the rates, then you can by your simple act make it a loan to that man?

That has always been my opinion.

4671. So that without any contract on the part of the man, you can place him under a legal obligation to repay you?

Without any contract, but not without a declaration of loan.

4672. We
4672. We are, of course, taking a case where it is well ascertained that relief is needed. I suppose you would direct that the relief should be given by way of loan?

Yes.

4673. Supposing that the man on that notification being given to him says, "I decline it on these terms," will you thereupon be absolved from the necessity of relieving that man, or could you still relieve him, and recover the loan, notwithstanding that he had declined to accept it upon those terms?

My opinion is that we could still relieve him and still declare such relief as was given to be by way of loan.

4674. Whether he accepted it in that form or not?

Quite so. I have always looked upon the relief given by the relieving officer in the interval between board meetings as provisional relief, and that when it comes before the board the guardians have the power to give or lend.

4675. Then I understand that you limit the case to what may be termed the provisional relief given by the relieving officer?

Yes.

4676. But you would not extend it to cases in which the guardians themselves act. Supposing that the guardians are going to order relief for the person in question, do you contend that they can then order it as loan, whether the person ordered to be relieved accepts it or not in that sense?

I can scarcely conceive of a case of prospective relief where the question of contract would come in. In my experience the cases in which relief is declared to be by way of loan are where the relief has been given by the relieving officer. With regard to prospective relief, cases have certainly occurred where for instance a man may apply for relief for the burial of his child. The guardians may say: "What are your circumstances now? Are you in work?" The man may say "No, I am not in work, but I hope to get work next week." "Very well then, the relieving officer will give you an order for the burial of the child, but you must understand that it will be upon loan."

4677. Supposing that the case is one where the child has to be buried, and the man entirely declines to accept the relief on loan, what course do you take?

In the case of the burial of a child the relieving officer would not move further at all then.

4678. In that case you would have to bury the child?

Possibly, the emergency might arise.

4679. And you think you could recover the expenses afterwards?

I think so. I have never had any doubt about it myself. As I have always advised, authority is derived from Sec. 58 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1834, which parenthetically contains the words "and whether any receipt for such relief, or engagement to repay the same, or the cost price thereof, shall have been given or not by the person to or on account of whom the same shall have been so given."

4680. You spoke of the contribution which, no doubt, it is very proper should be recovered from vicious parents whose children are being taken care of by the guardians; but would it not be the case that from the very nature and condition of those parents in a large number of instances no contribution could ever be enforced?

That would be the case, unquestionably.

4681. With regard to the scheme for employing London paupers upon farms in the country, you used the expression that it would tend to train the men for agricultural labour; is it desirable that you should add to an agricultural population which is already apparently unable to obtain full employment?

They are unable to obtain full employment in this country; yet the fact that
there is land waiting for cultivation either here or in the colonies, suggests that labour must sooner or later be found.

4682. I suppose that the fact that agricultural labourers migrate to a considerable extent, and have always migrated into the towns, shows pretty plainly that the natural increase of the population cannot be provided for, at all events in the present state of affairs, by agricultural labour in the rural districts; is it a rational system to add further to that surplus population?

I am not prepared to answer that question.

4683. Probably you would contemplate the emigration of the persons so trained, which, of course, would not be open to the objection which I have suggested?

I am disposed to regard emigration as the chief outlet for such trained labour.

4684. You said that under the Act putting the cost of in-door poor in London on the common fund you thought that there might be this unfairness: that whereas the administration was strict in Whitechapel, in other unions the administration might be lax, so that you might be paying for unions who were not administering well. But so far as it goes is not the effect of that Act to encourage strict administration, inasmuch as it gives a special contribution for in-door poor, and not for out-door relief?

If it has any kind of influence upon the administration of relief it is no doubt in that direction.

4685. Is it not a fact that the diminution of out-door relief in London commenced as near as may be after the passing of that Act, and has continued ever since; can you possibly dissociate the one thing from the other?

I am rather disposed to dissociate them, and to say that it is a coincidence. It was a date at which certain unions in London actually were commencing a strict administration which was gradually followed by others.

4686. Is not the coincidence rather a remarkable one?

I can only say with any positiveness that as regards Whitechapel, the Metropolis Poor Act, 1867, was not a factor in the application of strict principles to administration.

4687. Are boards of guardians in London not influenced by the motive that influences most of mankind, namely, the desire to save money for the people for whom they administer the law?

Yes, no doubt it is so.

4688. Is not such a motive praiseworthy within certain limits?

I can scarcely regard it is praiseworthy to save the pockets of their own rate-payers at the cost of others.

4689. But if the law has distinctly given to the board a right to draw money from a general fund, is it not praiseworthy to get as much from that general fund to relieve the rate-payers as you can, provided of course, that it does not render the administration of the law in other ways a less good administration. At all events whether it be praiseworthy or not, it is not perfectly certain that that will influence ninety-nine men out of a hundred?

There is no doubt of it.

4690. Then may we not conclude that whatever may have happened in Whitechapel, that Act had a large effect in reducing out-door relief in London?

Possibly.

4691. You consider that guardians in London are not actuated by the ordinary motives that affect mankind?

There is probably little difference in that respect, but I am rather disposed to judge other boards by the result of my experience of the Whitechapel Board in the matter of out-door relief.

4692. Earl Spencer.] I understood you to say that there had been some boards of guardians who had been limiting out-door relief before that Act was passed?

I think Whitechapel commenced the limitation.
4693. Had Whitechapel commenced before this Act was passed?
No, but what I meant to say was this: when the Metropolitan Poor Act was passed we had not commenced the process of restriction, and I have no recollection of any other union having then adopted the policy of restriction. I believe Whitechapel was the first.

4694. Then was it a pure experiment on the part of the Government of the day who introduced it?
With regard to the process of diminution of relief in Whitechapel, that was the result of the obvious abuse of the out-door relief regulation order in that union. I am only dealing with Whitechapel.

4695. Chairman.] Whatever may have been the influence of that Act, which I contend must have been, on the whole, considerable in London, it would be only fair to say that in Whitechapel, quite apart from that, the guardians have been actuated by a desire to administer the law in such a way as to diminish pauperism in their union?
I say that confidently.

4696. Earl Spencer.] Other causes, besides that Act, induced you to follow the course which has had the result which you have told us?
Yes.

4697. Chairman.] If there were such Act, you would strongly advocate that system?
Yes.

4698. Lord Balfour of Burley.] And no general diminution of pauperism, consequent upon the Act of 1870, will account for the special diminution which you have brought about in your own union?
Not at all.

4699. Lord Sandhurst.] I am not clear about this immigration of labourers from the country districts into the towns; do I correctly understand you to say that it goes on to a certain extent, and is stimulated; supposing there is a Mansion House fund; or does it only take place when some Mansion House fund is collected?
It is apparent at those times, when there are special funds in operation in London. At those times we do hear and see that there is an immigration of poor into London.

4700. But not under ordinary circumstances?
Not under ordinary circumstances.

4701. Chairman.] Have you anything to add to what you have already stated to the Committee?
Might I be allowed to say that I have not the Return before me which would have enabled me specifically to answer the question as to the proportion of persons receiving medical relief; but I have here a Return of the paupers in receipt of relief on the 1st of January 1888, and I find that there were receiving medical relief only on that day, 35.

4702. Earl Spencer.] That is to say, out-door medical relief?
Yes. I understand that evidence has been given with regard to the relative pauperism to population in certain districts of London; that is to say, that in unions where the out-door relief system is generally followed, the ratio of pauperism is even less than in some other districts.

4703. Earl of Aberdeen.] In some cases?
In some cases. I have heard instanced the parish of Paddington, where they have 1,232 paupers, while Whitechapel has 1,237, so that the pauperism is about the same. I find that the population of Whitechapel is 71,000, and the population of Paddington is 107,000; but the main point that I desired to mention to the Committee was this: that you cannot fairly compare one parish or district with another by population, but you must take the character of the population. For instance, in Paddington the rateable value of the property is (70.)
1,276,000 l., whereas in Whitechapel the rateable value is 379,000 l. Whitechapel is made up of a very poor and large lodging-house district, as is St. George’s-in-the-East, more or less. From the rateable value it is obvious that Paddington is a large residential district, and the poor are comparatively few in number.

4704. Chairman.] For example, in St. George’s-in-the-East I find by a Return which I have before me that the mean number of paupers relieved on the 1st of July 1887, and on the 1st of January 1888, gives a total ratio of 33.9 per 1,000 of the population, the ratio for the whole of London being 24.2; but we know that the administration in St. George’s-in-the-East is strict. The figures might be accounted for by the peculiarly poor character of the people in that district?

Yes. The rateable value of St. George’s-in-the-East is only 85,000 l.

4705. Earl Spencer.] It is not fair to compare one parish with another; you ought to compare the different periods of each parish, because the circumstances of parishes vary so very much?

Yes, very much.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. ROBERT ARTHUR VALPY, is called in; and Examined, as follows:

4706. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have you for some time paid a good deal of personal attention to the condition of the poor in connection with the branches of the Charity Organization Society, and otherwise.

I have, for the last 10 or 12 years been connected with St. Giles’s Charity Organization Society; I have been vice-chairman of it for some three or four years; and recently I have been elected as chairman of the Battersea Charity Organization Society.

4707. Have you given any special attention to the question of casuals with reference, for example, to what we were told by a previous witness, the Rev. Mr. Kitto, concerning the result of some inquiries which had been instituted upon the question of casuals?

I have, Mr. Kitto’s committee visited the casual ward at St. Giles’s for something like four weeks, from about the beginning of December to the beginning of January. They selected out of the ward about 100 cases; the actual number was 98, and I think we may roughly estimate that the number of casuals interviewed for the purpose of selecting the cases was about 800 or 900. Mr. Kitto’s committee commenced investigation and inquiry into the antecedents of these casuals, but eventually they referred the cases to my St. Giles’s Committee of the Charity Organization Society.

4708. How were the papers prepared which gave the required information?

I have a set of case-papers here which might interest the Committee. This shows the method of investigation which we adopted.

4709. Will you read a summary of the contents?

First of all, the casual was interviewed by a member of Mr. Kitto’s committee; and I may say that, in endeavouring to select those casuals, they were assisted by experts, inspectors of casual wards, the superintendent of the casual ward, and charity agents of various kinds, who attended with the members of the committee. After questioning the casual, the following questions were taken down, and the answers attempted to be verified: “Name? Age? Married or single? Number of children? Trade? Wages when in work? Ever in Trades Unions, or any Provident Club? How long out of work? How long during the past twelve months out of work? Names and addresses of as many recent employers as possible? If the man was employed on large works, ascertain name of his foreman or sub-contractor: Where slept last night? Where been sleeping lately? Where born? How long in London? Ascertain whether he is in London for the first time, or is really an inhabitant who makes excursions into the country?
country? References. Friends or relations in London or the country? Was he ever in the Army or Militia? Name of regiment, and regimental number? Does he produce discharge? If so, what character does it bear? How many years' service and whether in the Reserve? Then at the bottom of the page is added: "Please add your own impression about the man generally, his physique, and whether he is fit morally to emigrate, or whether it would be merely moving rubbish to help him to a colony." Those particulars were taken down, and the cases so selected were placed in lodging-houses, or in Ham Yard Refuge. Some of them were put to work on relief works, and from time to time reports of their work were sent in and endorsed on the back of these papers.

4710. What number were selected out of the total number of cases inquired into?

Ninety-eight cases were selected out of probably 800 or 900. I arrive at that number in this way. The St. Giles's Casual Ward is on the separate cell system, and contains 52 cells for males, and 24 cells for females. The immense press of applicants in consequence of the tickets distributed in Trafalgar-square, and the money distributed there, as Mr. Kitto described, filled the place to overflowing; and leave was obtained of the Local Government Board to make use of the waiting rooms for the purposes of additional sleeping accommodation. In this way there was accommodation for 74 males, I believe; that gave accommodation for 22 more. The applicants, I may say, were driven away from Trafalgar-square by the police in large numbers. Up to this period there was no casual ward in the Strand Union, but the pressure was so great that the Strand guardians opened a casual ward in Hart-street; and I may say that up to this time the casual ward in St. Giles's was seldom or never full.

4711. When you speak of cases being selected, does that imply that they were selected because they were the most likely to be fit subjects for emigration?

Because they were the most likely to be fit subjects for help of various kinds.

4712. Could you summarise the results of those inquiries?

Of the 98 cases so referred to the St. Giles's Charity Organisation Society, there were assisted on the recommendation of that society 22; nine were assisted by emigration; four by employment; three by sending to sea; three by migration; and six by tools, stock, and clothes.

4713. Were the results in those cases satisfactory?

Not in all these cases. The average age of these casuals was 33 years. There were 82 single men, or men who stated that they were single; three stated that they were married; nine were widowers; and no information could be obtained with regard to about four. I considered as Londoners 28 of those. In estimating whether these men were Londoners or countrymen I looked through the information that we obtained, and where I found that a man had been regularly employed in London for the last eight or nine years, I considered him a Londoner; where a man had recently come up from the country, I put him down as a countryman. Of these there were 28 Londoners, 63 countrymen, and I could obtain no information about seven. There seemed to have been regularly employed 17, and intermittently employed 39. The character we ascertained in 51 cases. Of those there appeared to be good, 28; fair, five; and bad, 18. Of the rest it may be inferred, I think, that their character was bad, as they either refused inquiry or disappeared. The number of those was 49. Three gave false references, one of them refused work which was offered, and one refused emigration.

4714. Did only one out of the whole number refuse work when offered?

A large number disappeared; 44 disappeared altogether, but one refused work after we had made inquiries into his antecedents and hoped to help him. With regard to their capacity for work, there were spoken of by former employers as having been good workmen, nine only. Of these we assisted: one (70.)
by emigration, and the others were assisted in different ways. We tested on relief works, 15 in all. Of these we emigrated eight; five dis- appeared after working for a short time; one refused emigration, and one turned out to be insane. The test work, I may say, consisted of stone- breaking or work provided by Lord Meath’s Public Gardens Association, and the test may be said to have been fairly severe. Frequent reports of the work done were sent into our committee, and on these they decided whether the case was fit for emigration. In one or two instances, men were sent back for further probation before being emigrated. With regard to the occupations of these casuals, they were very varied, the number being 39 out of the 98 cases; but of course the information on this point was very unreliable, as it was derived mainly from the statements of the casuals themselves. Of these people only five described themselves as agricultural labourers. Of them one will probably make a good emigrant; another had stock given to him, and one disappeared, though he had a good character, and belonged to the Forsters. One was a regular tramp, and one a bad character. The one who was emigrated seemed to me to be the only genuine agricultural labourer. There were three who might be said to be gentlemen by birth; one was a Roman Catholic priest of good character; one had been in the Medical Staff Corps, and had a good character, but he disappeared; one had been in South Africa with Sir Charles Warren, and having got work was helped with a loan for clothes; 14 had been in the Army. Only two out of the whole number of 98 had ever belonged to a club.

4715. Earl of Milltown.] When you say that 14 had been in the Army, I suppose you mean that they had been privates or non-commissioned officers? Yes.

4716. Earl of Aberdeen.] Do you include trades unions in the expression “club?”

No; I include in the term “clubs” only the benefit clubs.

4717. I observe that one of the questions was, “Had the man ever been a member of a trades union or a club?”

I do not think we found any belonging to a trades union; I do not remember one. If I might summarise the occupations of these 98 casuals, they were as follows: employed in labour, varying from casual labour to regular labour, 29; artisans, 9; engaged in locomotion, such as grooms and coachmen, 9; assistants, people engaged in shops and offices, 8; manufacturers, 23; dealers, 2; costermongers, 2; the salaried class, 9; no work, 6; refused information, 3.

The causes of distress are to a great extent matters of conjecture, but as we ascertained them in 56 cases they may be summarised in this way: loafers, including thieves, 15; irregularity of work, 39; drink, 13; illness or infirmity, 13; one or a combination of these causes accounts for their condition, so far as we could gather from the information we received with regard to them. It occurs to me that probably many of these men had left their own districts to avoid the execution of warrants or the serving of summonses, I think that may account for a certain number from conversations I had with some of them. I have no doubt myself that the vagrant class is very largely swelled in this way, but I have no direct evidence of it. Of the 22 cases that we actually assisted I should say that it was very doubtful whether more than six can be considered as being really decent fellows.

4718. By “decent fellows” you would mean perhaps persons who had fallen into difficulties without any actual fault?

Yes; a man who would make a good emigrant, or turn out satisfactorily. I might add that Miss Tillard, in St. James’s, has undertaken an investigation into the cases of something like 400 or 500 casuals and other homeless people, on the same lines as myself; but the casuals were mostly taken at random, and not selected in the manner I have described. Her information with regard to those 400 or 500 cases which have been investigated by the St. James’s Charity Organization Society will, I think, be very interesting.

4719. Will
4719. Will you state the conclusions at which you have arrived with reference to the casual ward system as the result of those investigations?

The conclusions that I arrive at are that casual wards should be abolished, because they do not fulfil the object for which they were established. They were established for the benefit of wanderers and wayfarers, and people out of work seeking employment. That is my view of the Act under which the casual wards have been instituted. Secondly, they attract and help to keep up the vagrant class by affording them shelter and the very small percentage of helpable cases does not justify their existence; and I myself, think that, entrance to and detention in the workhouse would be most likely to form the best test of eligibility for assistance. There is another objection that I have to them; that they form a harbour for criminals, because there is no supervision from the police; at least that is the case in the St. Giles' ward.

4720. Do you mean by that that criminals resort to these places, or those who frequent the wards become criminal by association with reckless persons?

I think that criminals do resort to those places, and that they affect others.

4721. How would you propose to provide for the class to which you refer, namely, bona fide wayfarers, persons seeking employment?

I think that discretion might be given to the master of a casual ward or to the master of the workhouse as to detaining these people. If the case seemed prima facie helpable, they should be referred to some charitable agency to undertake inquiry into their antecedents; and in certain cases they might be sent on their way. But in other cases which appeared to be prima facie worthy of assistance the people should be employed on some sort of probationary work. I may say with regard to the detention in the workhouse, that we tried the following experiment eight or nine years ago with regard to the St. Giles' workhouse One member of our committee visited the workhouse from the end of 1879, I think, to the beginning of 1881, for a period of about 15 months. With the help of the master of the workhouse he selected 47 cases, as probably being fit objects for assistance. Of those 47, four were assisted with good results, and rendered self-supporting, the character in each case being good; 10 were assisted with apparently good results, their character in seven cases being good, and in two fair; one was doubtful as to sobriety; eight cases were assisted with no good results, and returned to the Poor Law; the character of those was good in four cases, fair in two, doubtful in one, and in the other case the report was, "Man's character good, wife's bad." Two of those refused loans offered; character of one good, and of the other fair. Twenty-three applications were refused either through bad character, or there being no prospect of taking them off the rates.

4722. May the Committee understand that you would not be in favour of any separate building for wayfarers, but that you would merely admit them to the workhouse under certain regulations?

I should admit them to the workhouse under certain regulations, and those who seemed to be genuine wayfarers I should remove from the workhouse, and give them shelter in a night refuge, assuming that night refuges exist.

4723. Have you had any experience of the working of night refuges under voluntary management apart from the Poor Law?

I have visited Mr. Bolton's House of Shelter at Stepney; I have also visited the Ham Yard Refuge and the Newport Market Refuge; and in my opinion with the exception of Ham Yard refuges and shelters are not desirable institutions as at present conducted. I think that good may be done in a few cases, but the harm done far outweighs the good, because they attract, and to a great extent keep in existence, the idle loafing classes, and they fail to be shelters for the genuine working-man in search of work, the object for which they exist in theory. Assuming that they do exist I think they should be only utilized for this object; and this can only be attained after due investigation and inquiry into their circumstances, and antecedents. At present this investigation seems to me entirely insufficient, except in the case of the Ham Yard Refuge in Windmill-street, which has lately been put under new regulations; (70.)
and which so far as helping the class of genuine working-men looking for work goes, I think is well managed. There an applicant, unless he is obviously a tramp, is admitted for one night, and the next morning he is sent to the local Charity Organisation Committee; that is to say, the St. James' Committee. This committee takes down the particulars of his case, and if it appears prima facie helpable, he is allowed to continue in the refuge. After inquiry he is either dismissed; that is to say, if the case turns out ineligible for assistance; or he is allowed to remain there until he can be assisted in whatever way the committee think fit to assist him. He may be kept there according to the rules as long as a fortnight, but it may be longer, it is in the superintendent's discretion. The accommodation at Ham Yard is excellent; they have beds with sheets, and good dietary. The Newport Market Refuge too has very good accommodation, but in my opinion there is an entire absence of proper investigation into the cases which they take in. The Stepney House of Shelter is not an attractive place, but from inquiries that I have made I have no doubt that it does attract a large number of Whitechapel loafers. The promoters of it do attempt to assist applicants for shelter; but the investigation and inquiry made with this object are altogether insufficient to ensure anything like good results.

4724. When you say that it attracts loafers, do you mean that it encourages loafers in their loafing habits?

I think it does.

4725. Such as the groups one sees at the street corners?

Yes, those sort of people. I do not mean to say that it attracts the corner loafer in the first instance, as a corner loafer, but I think the corner loafer gradually descends into the class of casual.

4726. Do you consider that vagrants and tramps are on the increase?

I cannot say from my own experience whether they are on the increase or not in London; but I am convinced that they are to a great extent an artificial class fostered by an unwise distribution of charity.

4727. Have you any experience of what is known as the Berkshire ticket system in connection with dealing with tramps?

I think that the facts which have come to our knowledge conclusively show that the casual class is largely recruited from the country, and I think that some modification of the Berkshire system would be a very good way of dealing with tramps; but in order to make it effective the system ought to be uniform all through the country.

4728. Will you describe the Berkshire system?

Perhaps I might read a letter which was written to me by Colonel Blandy, our chief constable, which describes it very accurately: "The ‘Berkshire system’ of dealing with tramps has been in abeyance for the last three years. It was rendered inoperative by the Reading Borough Union withdrawing from union with the county, and refusing to issue the tickets. The system was very simple, viz., at the first union in the county where a tramp sought admittance a ticket was given to him with his accurate description on it, and the several unions to which he was to go on his passing through the county; so that he had to go a certain number of miles each day; and to prove to the charitably disposed that he would have enough to eat, he could on the production of his ticket receive half-a-pound of bread at some police station between the union he left in the morning and the one he was ordered to go at night. It worked very well, and reduced the number nearly two-thirds. Since this plan has been dropped the number of tramps has multiplied wonderfully. For instance, in the Maidenhead union when the system was in work, about 400 per quarter were admitted into the union, but last quarter 1,917 sought shelter there, and the other unions show similar results. I enclose you the report of the Poor Law Conference held at Guildford in 1872, which contains my remarks on vagrancy, and on which I founded the Berkshire system the same year." I was led to inquire into the working of that system.

4729. Chairman.
4729. **Chairman.**] Can you explain exactly how that operates as a check on the vagrants?

It keeps the vagrants on the move, I think, and directs them along the principal main roads in the county.

4730. What happens if a vagrant does not move?

If he is caught begging outside the limits of his route he is severely dealt with by the magistrates. I think the magistrates came to the conclusion a few years ago that they would always send a man to prison for a fortnight with hard labour if he was caught begging.

4731. But that is not peculiar to Berkshire; it is enforced in many districts?

I am afraid that it is not enforced as it ought to be.

4732. Then the system simply consists in this: that if a man has this ticket he is exempt from being dealt with as a vagrant by the magistrate?

Not at all. The object of giving him a ticket for bread is to prove to the public that there is no necessity for giving alms to him.

4733. The object really is to prevent indiscriminate charity being given?

It is.

4734. Earl of Aberdeen.] As a matter of fact it reduced the number of tramps in a district?

It reduced the number of tramps perceptibly; and since the system has been done away with the number of tramps has increased enormously all over the county.

4735. **Chairman.**] Was it then the fact in Berkshire that the charitable people generally ceased to give to vagrants moving from one place to another, and begging in the ordinary manner unless they produced this ticket?

I am afraid they all did not, but a large number of them did, because placards were put up all over the county asking people not to give, and stating that vagrants had bread provided for them at different stations.

4736. So that, in point of fact, it had the effect of preventing the beggars from obtaining their accustomed alms?

It had, to a certain extent. Of course a considerable number of people still would give, in spite of the warnings, but a very large number of people left off giving.

4737. At whose expense was the bread provided?

The bread was provided by voluntary contributions, and the chief constable told me that the whole expense for one year was about 10l. for bread given.

4738. Earl of Aberdeen.] In fact it was an example, was it not, of the good effect as regards checking indiscriminate almsgiving, of giving the public or any portion of the public a feeling of confidence that persons whom they saw going about were not in danger of starving?

Quite so.

4739. Have you had experience as a magistrate in dealing with such matters?

I have had considerable experience during the last few years as a magistrate in Glamorganshire; and in my view the begging class ought to be more severely punished than they are; I am afraid that magistrates are too soft-hearted. It is the administration of the law which is defective, and not the law itself.

4740. Is it not inevitable that there will be what you describe as a soft-hearted administration so long as there is a large amount of actual and undoubted poverty, and so long as it is not always easy to ascertain which are the genuine cases, and which are not?

I think it is most desirable that in every populous place there should be some charitable society which could be referred to. Frequently, when I have been
on the bench I have asked whether there was any charitable society which could be referred to, and I have been told that there was not. Many cases come under my view which might have been very well dealt with by some society, such as a Charity Organization Society. Since that time I am glad to say that a charity organization society has been started at Cardiff, and they have done a certain amount of work.

4744. On the other hand can you give us your experience of cases where there has been this co-operation which you advocate between Poor Law authorities and charitable organizations?

We have co-operated with the guardians to a certain extent in St. Gile's. There was the case of a blind women which is typical I think of the way in which co-operation may be brought about. She was a single women aged 32; from childhood she had worked as a tailoress for sweaters, and owing to poor living and long hours, lost her sight. She was assisted for some time while she was attending the hospital, and it was hoped that she might recover. When she was pronounced incurable she went to the workhouse. The case was brought to my knowledge, and I made careful inquiries as to whether it would be possible to teach her anything that would render her self-supporting. Eventually an institution was found where she is now being taught, and the guardians contribute to this institution an amount representing the cost of her maintenance while in the workhouse. The cost of maintaining her in this institution is £20 a year, and the balance is contributed through personal friends of mine.

4742. Has there been co-operation with the School Board officers as regards the relief of the poor in your district?

I am a manager of schools in Battersea, and I am glad to say that I have brought about very excellent co-operation between the School Board visitors and the local charity organization society. We are in daily communication with them as to the condition of persons who apply to us for assistance, and they frequently refer cases to us; and I may say that when I am on the "Notice B." committee, any case that occurs to me as being likely to be usefully or permanently assisted, I refer to our committee, and in some cases we have been successful in removing them from the Poor Law.

4743. Can you give us any results of your experience in connection with exceptional distress; for instance, the distress which led to the formation of the Mansion House Fund?

I was the treasurer for the districts of St. Gile's and St. George's, Bloomsbury, and part of the Old Strand Union, which is known as Clare Market; and I can only say that I hope I shall never have such an experience again as long as I live. Money was sent, I may say, almost broadcast into the district, and we had the greatest difficulty in applying it to the right objects. It was sent to me as almoner of the society for the relief of distress, and it was sent also to various clergymen. The condition on which the money was subscribed was, that it should be given for the assistance of deserving working men temporarily out of employment; but I have every reason to believe that the greater proportion of this £72,000 was contributed by the public, went in the form of doles to chronic cases of distress, and that, comparatively few genuine working men were really benefited by it.

4744. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Were there any whom you could benefit of that class?

There were a certain number. In St. Gile's, after a great deal of trouble, and going about myself and searching for them, I discovered a few cases of genuine working men out of employment, whom I was able to assist; but the great majority of the people whom we did assist were people who lived by casual work and irregular employment.

4745. Earl of Aberdeen.] I suppose that class of person is always more prominent and pushing in applying than the genuine working man, even though the working man be in greater need?
They are. I may say that the crowd of ragamuffins, as I may describe them, of all descriptions around our office from day to day, entirely prevented the genuine working man applying; the genuine working men would not face this crowd, and we had to go and find them out ourselves. Sometimes there were 300 or 400 of these people at our office, and I had to make my way through them before I could get there, and frequently I had to go out and address them to get them to go away. At last I had to call in the assistance of the police, who cleared the place. That was the result of our office being publicly advertised as a place where relief could be obtained.

4746. Are there any other remarks which you wish to offer upon kindred subjects?

There is one remark which I should like to make with regard to the tramps relieved at Wandsworth. The Wandsworth Charity Organisation Society investigated the cases of about 2,800 of these tramps, and only found about six capable of being helped in any way.

4747. Those were applicants, I presume?

They were not applicants. The officers of the society went to the workhouse for 72 nights, and he interviewed something like the number I have mentioned, viz., 2,800. Twenty-two were selected as probably being helpable; 11 refused to answer any inquiry; and only six seemed to be cases that ought to be helped.

4748. Have you had any share in efforts for the promotion of thrift?

I have had experience as chairman of one branch of our Berkshire Friendly Society, and I think it is most important that Juvenile Friendly Societies should be established in connection with Friendly Societies generally. It has the effect of inducing the children to join the parent society when they arrive at the right age for doing so. I think also that it is most desirable that insurance for pensions in old age should be adopted. I believe that insurance for pensions in old age is only adopted in the case of very few societies, and if that could be brought about more largely, I think it would be a great advantage.

4749. Will you describe a little more fully your idea of the constitution of Juvenile Friendly Societies.

I have not the rules before me at the moment. The children contribute a certain amount for medical relief and medical attendance; up to, I think, 13 years of age. After that age they are allowed to insure for sick pay and to insure for an amount of not more than two-thirds of the wages which they earn, or the estimated value of their service.

4750. Earl Spencer.] That is to say that the parents insure them?

The parents insure them.

4751. Earl of Milltown.] Of course, the children do not themselves contribute?

No. Then when they arrive at the age of 15 or 16, or whatever the age is at which they are admitted into the parent society, they are admitted without the payment of any extra entrance fee.

4752. Earl of Aberdeen.] Is it so entirely in the hands of the parents that the training in thrift is not brought to bear upon the children?

It is largely in the hands of the parents. Of course, I am speaking of country districts; I have had no experience of the Juvenile Foresters in London; but we modelled our rules very largely upon the rules of the Juvenile Foresters in East London.

4753. When you spoke of 22 cases being selected among the Wandsworth casuals as being possibly helpable, did you mean to say that the remainder were chronic cases, or persons of confirmed habits of vagrancy?

I think they were people of confirmed habits of vagrancy who would not submit to investigation, or inquiry, or do any work.

4754. Lord Thring.] Does not the Berkshire experiment show that, in order to prevent the giving of indiscriminate relief, you must satisfy the public some-

(70.)
How or other that the poor men will be properly dealt with either by charity or by the Poor Law?
That is so.

4755. What do you suggest in a London parish, or indeed in any parish, as the best mode of satisfying the public upon that point?
I think that a charitable society consisting of well-known almoners in the district might be found, in whom the public would have confidence.

4756. Then you ought to make it as public as possible. Would you give tickets, or would you simply make it public that anybody who goes to a particular place, would be inquired about, and would receive charity or Poor Law relief as he deserved?
I should let it be publicly known that there exists this charitable agency to which anybody in distress might apply. Practically that is what is done by Charity Organisation committees now.

4757. But the difficulty in London is this; that nine people out of ten do not know that if they send applicants for relief to the Charity Organisation Committee they will get relief, and if they do know that, they do not know what particular place to send them to. For instance, I do not know myself in Kensington where to send them?
I think that information can be easily obtained in the Directories.

4758. It is mere neglect on the part of the people, you think?
If people would only take the trouble to inquire they would easily find out where these offices are.

4759. You do not think tickets necessary.
Tickets may be used with advantage. We distribute to our subscribers a packet of tickets, and we ask them if anybody begs of them, or any case of distress comes to their knowledge, to give the person a ticket, and not to relieve him.

4760. Earl of Hopetoun.] You told us that the Berkshire system was given up on a count of the Reading Union withdrawing from the system; was there any reason for that?
I was not able to ascertain the reason; I tried to ascertain it.

4761. Was there no danger under that system of men getting hankered on from one part of the county to the other when they had small sums of money of their own?
That is quite possible; there is no means of detecting that.

4762. Earl of Milltown.] You said something about the inadequacy of the investigations at the Newport Market Refuge before relief was afforded; are there any investigations at all?
I doubt whether there is any investigation.

4763. I understood that it was part of the system that there were not any investigations?
I do not think there are any investigations there; they help their people without investigation.

4764. Earl Strafford.] You do not think that Mr. Bolton's casual ward in the Commercial-road does any good?
If it was improved and utilised for the object to which these shelters should be applied, I think it might do some good.

4765. What would be the improvements that you would suggest?
I should have improved accommodation. At present the accommodation is as bad as anything can be. I went in there late one night when all these people were in bed, and it reminded me rather of a number of bodies being laid out for an inquest. They were in little wooden shells, almost like coffins, ranged in rows on the floor. They receive a very small amount of bread when they come in, and when they go out, and the sanitary arrangement appeared to me to be very unsatisfactory.

4766. The
4766. The Ham Yard Shelter you said was very well conducted?
Yes.

4767. Chairman.] You, of course, know that there are a large number of tramps who go down every year to the seaside, to races, and to places of that kind, who are, in fact, men who live by casual jobs, though they belong to the tramp class?
Yes.

4768. Will it not always be the case that a very large number of such people will be travelling about the country?
It must be the case. My only hope is that we may reduce the number to some extent. I think it would be impossible to eliminate the class altogether.

4769. Would you retain those men in a workhouse, who, though belonging no doubt to the tramp or loafer class, yet are men who are going to some part of the country where they expect to get some kind of odd jobs by which they eke out their existence?
I have not considered the question with regard to that particular class.

4770. But there is a large class, is there not, of that kind who are really tramps, but who work to a certain extent at certain kinds of odd jobs?
I think it most desirable to detain them; that would be a very good test of what they were.

4771. When you speak of detention, would you be in favour of empowering the guardians to detain them for a long period, say a week or a fortnight?
I think it is most desirable to detain them for at least a week.

4772. The small amount of detention which can now be enforced has not much practical effect?
No.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Jovis, 28\textsuperscript{o} Junii, 1888.
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Mr. HENRY HARDCASTLE, is called in; and Examined, as follows

4773. Chairman.] You have been for a considerable number of years a Guardian of the Poor, have you not?
I have.

4774. Of what union?
St. George's, Hanover-square, for 16 years; and for 11 years I was an elected guardian. On losing the annual election I was made, shortly afterwards, a magistrate; so that I am now an ex-officio guardian.

4775. Do you work by means of committees?
We do; all our work, in fact, is done by committees. The Board meets once a week.

4776. Can you tell us whether there has been any material change in the system in St. George's, Hanover-square, since you have been a guardian, as regards out-door relief?
Yes, very considerable. In 1870, St. George's, Hanover-square, and St. Margaret's and St. John's, Westminster, were formed into the St. George's, Hanover-square, Union. At that time we were giving away, in round figures, 16,000\$ a year in out-door relief, and relieving, roughly speaking, 5,000 people with out-door relief. I became a guardian in 1872, and we had a number of meetings to discuss the principles on which out-door relief should be given away, and it was in consequence of my being connected with the Charity Organisation Society that I was asked to become a guardian to assist in curtailing the amount of out-door relief that was being given away. A book was published, which I have here (I dare say your Lordship knows it) by Mr. Henry Longley, who was at that time a Poor Law Inspector. It is a Treatise on the Administration of the Poor Law, an extremely valuable treatise we all think it, and it is not at all long. After we had got it and perused it, we had a meeting of the guardians; the book was published in November 1873, and we had a meeting in July 1874; and we ultimately drew up the following rules on which out-door relief was to be in future given away. Shall I read them?

4777. If you please? The first is, "That a list of the names of all persons who have been in receipt of out-relief for more than three months, be printed every six months, and affixed in conspicuous places in the union;" and second is, "That the following notice be posted on the workhouse doors, relief offices, and other places where it can be seen by the poor: I. Out-door relief will in future be regarded as an indulgence to be granted in certain instances to persons of proved respectability, (70.) 3 x 3 whose
whose destitution has arisen from no fault of their own. II. Persons whose
destitution is the result of intemperance and improvidence, will be relieved
with their families inside the workhouse. III. An applicant for relief will
have to satisfy the guardians that when he was able to work he made every
reasonable effort by thrift and economy to provide against times of sickness and
adversity. Should the applicant fail to make this clear, out-door relief will be
refused, and he, with his family, will be required to enter the workhouse.”
Then the third resolution was: “The relieving officer shall in future visit the
homes of all able-bodied widows, and of all persons receiving relief on account
of temporary sickness, at uncertain intervals, at least once a fortnight, and they
shall visit the old and infirm cases at least once a month. A record of each
visit shall be duly noted in the application and report book, for the information
of the guardians when the pauper appears before them.” The fourth is:
“No able-bodied widow having less than two children dependant on her shall be
eligible for out-door relief, except during the first six months of her widowhood.”
The fifth is: “No woman deserted by her husband shall be eligible for out-
door relief except during the period required for making inquiries into the facts
of the desertion.” The sixth is: “That it be referred to the relief committee to
consider how Recommendation No 7, page 74, in Mr. Longley’s report, can
best be carried out.” And the seventh is: “That a letter be written to the
Local Government Board, stating that a special meeting of the guardians has
been held and resolutions passed, in order if possible to give effect to some of
the suggestions contained in Mr. Longley’s report.” That was printed on the 11th
of July 1874, and those resolutions remain in force, and we have endeavoured
to carry them out ever since. The result has been, with regard to the numbers, as
I said just now, that whereas we began by finding 5,000 and odd people receiving
out-door relief, and 16,000 £ a year being spent, we went very gradually down; the numbers being 5,000, 4,000, 3,000, 2,000, and so on, down to 1,000.
I have got here the report of last week, and at this present time we are relieving
368 people as out-door paupers, and we are spending about 40 £ a week,
that is to say, about 2,000 £ a year instead of 16,000 £ a year.

4778. Your population, I think, for the last census was 149,748?
It is nearly stationary.

4779. Has the population increased?
No; rather the reverse, I believe; not increased.

4780. Therefore no material correction has to be made for the population?
No; I think we might say that it has remained nearly stationary.

4781. Do you, in the case of widows with more than three children, give
relief to them or for the other children in the form of taking the children into
your school?
That is the principle on which we always endeavour to act. Immediately
they become widows we give them out-door relief, liberal out-door relief, for a
few weeks, to enable them to turn round and see what they are likely to do;
and then, after a few weeks (it depends on the case; it may be a month, or two
months, or three months), we refuse to give them any more relief in kind, and
we offer to take one or two, or perhaps even three, children into the district
schools. We find that that offer is often refused, because they have been able
to provide for themselves; and after a short time they are often anxious, if
possible, to get the children home again.

4782. I see by a return which I have here of the mean number of paupers
relieved on the 1st of July 1887, and the 1st of January 1888, excluding
vagrants and lunatics in asylums, that in the Union of St. George’s, Hanover-
square, the number of in-door paupers is 154 per thousand of population,
with 3.7 of out-door relief per thousand, as compared with the average in
London of 13.3 per thousand for the in-door relief, and 10.9 for the out-door
relief; and the total of your numbers is 19.1 per thousand, as compared with
24.2 for the whole of London. May I ask, with reference to those figures, have
you much poverty in your union?
In certain places; it is rather in this neighbourhood, which is in the union, that the poorer people are; but they are of the loafing description; they live in the lodging-houses, and they are hardly what I should call deserving poor people.

4783. But you have a considerable number of very poor persons in parts of your union?

Yes, certainly, there are.

4784. Have you any figures which would show whether your pauperism has decreased during the last, say, five years?

I do not think that in the last five years there has been much alteration. The application of those principles, which I just now read, brought down the pauperism very much. I mean by "pauperism," people receiving relief, so that for the first 10 years the numbers were reduced from 5,000 in receipt of out-door relief to 3,000; that was the first 10 years, and since then, since 1880, they have been reduced from 2,000 to 350.

4785. And with regard to the in-door poor, can you give us the number?
The in-door poor have increased in numbers. [See post. Question 4852.]

4786. Have you the figures for the last few years?

At the present time there are 1,981 inmates in our three workhouses, and this time last year there were 1,902; so that there is a slight increase.

4787. Therefore your pauperism is more or less stationary?

It is.

4788. Do you think that the poverty in the union is greater than it was a few years ago?

No, I should think that it was not; I should think that it was probably stationary; but people come and go so much that it is difficult to say.

4789. Now, with reference to your rules, could you tell me how you deal with new cases of infirm and aged persons?

If a person is infirm and aged and is earning something, we will say 3s., or 4s., or 5s. a week, and can show that half-a-crown a week, either in money or kind, will be a material assistance, we in that case give, say, on the average, half-a-crown a week to such people; but if they are absolutely destitute, or if they profess to be absolutely destitute, or will not show us what their means are, in that case we offer to take them into the house. We never give more than 2s. 6d. or 3s. Of course it would require 6s. or 7s. a week at least for a person to live exclusive of rent.

4790. Is there not this objection to a system of giving small sums of money to persons not earning enough to maintain themselves but earning somewhat, that it tends to reduce the rate of wages?

I think so, certainly; and that is one reason why we are so much opposed to out-door relief, and why we wish to give it only in what you may call exceptional cases.

4791. Still you do give it to a certain number of aged and infirm persons able to do something for themselves, I understand?

We do.

4792. But you said that you give it in "exceptional cases;" do you mean that you only give it where there is some special circumstance, or where the applicants are, in your opinion, specially deserving; or what rule do you act on?

I think the words Mr. Longley uses in his book, namely, that the poor should be "given clearly to understand that out-relief is to be granted only as an indulgence to deserving cases," and that you should "throw upon the applicant the burden of showing cause why he should be excepted from the rule of in-door relief," express the principle upon which we act.

4793. And in the case of aged and infirm persons who can earn nothing, if they come within what you consider is the exception, you give them a sufficient amount to support them?

(70.) 3 x 4
That would be very exceptional; at any rate it would only be for a short time. We might give, for instance, as much as 10 s. a week to a family; where the bread winner has broken his leg perhaps, or something of that kind, in order to prevent them from all having to come into the house; but that would last for a very short time.

4794. That is the case of a man able to earn, and by accident suddenly disabled; but I am speaking of aged and infirm persons who we will assume are respectable, and who make application for relief in a new case. I want to know how you deal with such a case as that, they being unable to earn anything?

However respectable people are, unless they can show that they are earning something, we refuse out-door relief, and we offer to take them into the house.

4795. Might I ask what is the ground upon which you make that distinction between aged and infirm people who can earn something, and aged and infirm people who can earn nothing; what is the object of your distinction?

I should say that it was in order that it may get about in the parish and in the union that if people do not choose to attempt either to lay by something or to put themselves into a position to earn something, they will have to come into the house.

4796. But I was contrasting the cases of two old men, equally respectable, one of whom becomes infirm and cannot earn anything, and the other is able to earn something. In the one case you sometimes give out-door relief, that is to say, in the case of the man who earns something; and in the other you do not; I suppose the reason is that you think that by restricting your relief to those who earn something you stimulate people to do the best they can?

Yes, that is so. And also we cannot always believe all these people say. If a man comes and says, "I am infirm and am quite incapable of earning anything at all." That may or may not be true. These people have so many means of earning a little that it scarcely ever is perfectly true.

4797. Then I gather that your Board has not that strong objection to what is sometimes called a system of doles, that is to say, giving some portion of the relief needed, and leaving the rest to be earned?

Speaking personally, I have a very strong objection to doles. I have been saying now what we do; not my own personal opinion; and I should say that the majority of the Board are against doles (although you cannot help calling this 2 s. 6 d. a dole); but they do it partly. There is a great deal of pressure from outside; the elected guardians are elected on condition that they do give these doles. I myself lost my election as an elected guardian, to a great extent, because I refused to carry out this system of doles. I have brought with me the manifesto they put out when I lost my election. They opposed me because they wished to have guardians who "will exercise a kindly and considerate supervision over the aged poor and widows with children who are now forced into the workhouse." That means that I individually objected to these doles.

4798. But your own opinion is that those doles are not desirable?

My own opinion is that they are most objectionable.

4799. You probably think that they tend to lower the rate of wages, and to demoralise the people?

Yes, they pauperise the people; they are opposed to any principle of thrift; and if it gets about in the place that you have only got to ask for a dole, and are certain to get it, if you only go on asking long enough, it does, in my opinion, unmixed harm.

4800. Do you think that the Act which was passed by which the in-door poor are paid lor out of the common fund in London has had much effect in reducing the out-door relief, and causing a stricter administration?

Certainly, in the East End, where it costs them nothing to take the people into the house; but in our union it costs us about 4 s. each fresh case that is admitted.
admitted. The 5 d. a day that we get out of the common fund so works out that it costs us about 4s. a week for each additional case that we take into the workhouse, and 7s. a week each additional case that we take into the infirmary. Therefore, of course, from an economical financial point of view, it costs the same if we allow 4s. a week to a person out of the house as if we took the person into the house; but the principle, of course, is perfectly different, and on principle we refuse the out-door relief as a matter of course.

4801. From your financial position relatively to other unions, you have no special pecuniary inducement to give in-door relief rather than out-door relief?

No, I think it may be said that we have not. The City of London are the richest, and we are the second largest ratepayers.

4802. Therefore, in restricting your out-door relief, you may be said to have acted generally on the principle that such an administration of the Poor Law is more beneficial, both to the individual and to the ratepayers?

Yes. We had these resolutions drawn up after a great deal of discussion with the late Sir Charles Trevelyan, and gentlemen of that kind, who wished to act on principle, whatever part of London it might be in.

4803. Have you any labour yard in your union?

We have a labour yard. I have brought with me the paper relating to that (handing in the same).

4804. This labour yard is, I suppose, only at work in the winter?

Yes, in the winter; it is not at work now, and there are very few persons there in the winter.

4805. What number of persons were there last winter?

I do not think there were ever more than nine or ten there at the same time; perhaps 30 or 40 may have had orders given them, which they could make use of any day if they liked to do so. An order for the labour yard an applicant can use on any day that he likes to go there, and then he gets his allowance of so much, according to whether he is a single man or has got a wife and children.

4806. As you have so few persons going to the labour yard, what is the necessity for it?

My own opinion is that it is not necessary, and we do not always open it. Last winter we did open it after a great deal of discussion and pressure by certain elected guardians who considered it desirable; by pressure, I mean that they urged the Board to open it, more especially the guardians elected from the Westminster part of the union, and last winter we had the labour yard open; but I suppose that half of the years I have been a guardian we have had no labour yard at all.

4807. Was there special pressure for relief last year in your union; a special number of applicants?

No; the amount of destitution was certainly not greater than usual.

4808. Then I must repeat my question, I am afraid. What is the ground upon which some guardians desire this labour yard; do they think it a more effective mode than any other of dealing with such cases?

They think it very undesirable that the people should be, what is called, forced into the house; and they are prepared to do almost anything to prevent their being forced into the house. I am only saying what I believe to be their opinion; it is not my opinion, of course.

4809. Do you think that there is any imposture amongst the applicants who are relieved in your labour-yard; men receiving relief who might obtain employment to support themselves?

Perhaps not exactly imposture, but they are theidlest and greatest vagabonds in the place; they are not deserving people who are out of work from no fault of their own.

4810. Do you think that if they were offered in-door relief they would all accept it?

(76.)
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No,
No, I do not think they would; that is the reason we have not always had this labour yard open.

4811. Should you see any objection to the Poor Law Board prohibiting your labour yard?
No, I should not, myself, at all.

4812. Would you, if it were prohibited, have any difficulty in dealing with all cases that might apply?
Oh, dear no; not the slightest.

4813. Therefore I may gather that, as far as your opinion is concerned, the labour yard might perfectly well be stopped altogether?
Certainly.

4814. And, at all events, it would be sufficient if the Local Government Board, in the event of your workhouse being unduly full, relaxed its order, and enabled you, for an exceptional case, to open the labour-yard?
We should be very glad if we were absolutely prohibited by law from having a labour-yard. I believe I may say that for the majority of the guardians.

4815. You have a casual ward in your union, I think?
We have.

4816. With, I suppose, the usual regulations?
Yes.

4817. Nothing special in it?
There is nothing special about our casual ward.

4818. Then I need not ask you upon that. Now, in your opinion, does the system of casual wards work well, or would you propose any alteration of it?
I think it is most objectionable. It is utterly unnecessary. We had a long discussion a few months ago about the casual ward in consequence of a communication from the Government. We have a casual ward on what is called the cellular system, and there was a point of law raised before the magistrates whether we had a right to lock the casuals up at night. The magistrate seemed to think that we had not; consequently we have not done so since then. That led to a great discussion on the whole question, and we passed a resolution at our Board that casual wards were undesirable and objectionable, and ought to be entirely done away with. We went into the question to see how casual wards had originally arisen, and it appears that in our union, casual wards were first started about 30 years ago on the idea that there were a number of honest wayfarers, as they are called, going about who required a night’s lodging, going from place to place for work, and whom it was very unfair and very hard to drive into a workhouse. That may have been the case 30 years ago; that of course I know nothing about; but it most certainly is not the case at the present time; and the people who favour us with their company in our casual ward are, I may say, with almost no exception, one in 100 perhaps, the lowest people, people who are commonly called casuals, in fact loafers about.

4819. Professional vagrants?
Professional vagrants. I say that because we had a very careful inquiry about them; a number of philanthropic gentlemen last winter volunteered to come into our casual ward night by night, and question these people, in order to see if it was possible to find any one that they could help, and they were prepared to help them, and give them work; but they failed utterly, and it was found that they were all of this professional itinerant description, and that, in fact, notwithstanding that the Local Government Board have an officer for the 11 casual wards of London, they were in the habit of dodging this officer; they passed certainly three or four nights in the week in these casual wards, and we presume that the other nights they passed in the lodging-houses where you can get accommodation for 24 hours for fourpence. They managed by some means, honest or dishonest, to obtain sufficient to enable them to have a night’s lodging
in the lodging-houses of which we have a number in this neighbourhood; and when they had not money sufficient to pay for a night's lodging, then, of course, they favoured us at the casual ward. We were very much overrun in consequence of the people being allowed to congregate together in Trafalgar-square in the autumn, and our casual ward being one of the nearest, I daresay your Lordships may have seen a description in the paper of a number of disturbances that took place at the Buckingham Palace-road workhouse, where our casual ward is situate, and we had to send a number of these people up to our workhouse in the Fulham-road night by night during several months in the winter. But the opinion that we all formed was that this system was perfectly useless at the present time, and did a great deal more harm than good.

4826. From the examination which was made of the characters of these casual paupers, could you form any opinion as to what proportion of them might be considered to be of a more deserving kind; persons who might be worthy of assistance to obtain work?

As far as we could gather (we had very little means of verifying their statements to these gentlemen of whom I have spoken, who went about in conjunction with the Charity Organisation Society to a certain extent) we believe that a very small proportion indeed were in any sense of the word deserving. They were probably people who had lost their character in some part of the country, and who wished to get away from their immediate belongings, and so they came up to London. It has been stated, no doubt, that perhaps one in 40 or 50 is a deserving person; but in my own opinion one in 100 would be nearer the mark.

4821. Then if you abolished the casual wards, you would receive all such applicants into the workhouse in the ordinary manner?

Yes.

4822. Would you advocate any greater power of detention than you now possess; because otherwise of course you might have a number of persons going in and out of the workhouse constantly?

There are unfortunately at the present time a very large number of persons going in and out of the workhouse constantly.

4823. And this abolition of the casual wards would add very largely to the number if there were no new regulations, would it not?

I am not quite sure that it would, because I think these casuals come up to London because they know that casual wards are one of the ways in which they can provide for themselves. I do not think they would come if they did not know that they could go into these places. They would not like the workhouse nearly so well no doubt.

4824. But I understand that you would advocate a greater power of detention?

Yes.

4825. Do you consider that a greater power of detention is indispensable if you abolish your casual ward; or would you be prepared to abolish the casual ward in any case?

Certainly, I would be prepared to abolish the casual ward in any case, without altering the law; but I also wish, speaking individually, that we had the power of detaining the people certainly a week; I should like to see it extended, as I believe it is in Holland, and in Canada, and in different other places, to a month in the case of habitual ins-and-outs as we call them. I have the figures here. We always put down each week the number of admissions. During the week ending 9th June 1888, we had from common lodging-houses, 56; from other places in the union, 136; re-admissions, 103 (those are the ins-and-outs). Transfers between the workhouses and infirmary, 56; births, 2. That makes the admissions in that week, 353.
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4826. If these casual poor were all brought into the workhouse they would all be by law removable to their parishes?

Yes, of course, that would be so.

4827. Do you think that many of them would be removed, or that the difficulty of proving their settlement would be so great that there would not be many removals?

I think it would be a very difficult thing indeed to remove them; because you know nothing about them except what they say, and nearly all that they say is untrue. People who have lost their character do not wish to be removed back to the places where they are known. I think there would be very little more removing done than is done at the present time. The removing is not of these ins-and-outs; it is of unfortunate people taken ill who are not ashamed of their belongings, and very often they are glad to be removed back to their own part of the country.

4828. Have you observed any unusual number of agricultural labourers in your union during the last two or three years coming from the country?

No, I cannot say that we have not people who give themselves out as agricultural labourers who were obliged to leave the country because they could not get work. There are, no doubt, many from the country, and they may have been some time in their lives labourers.

4829. Have you a district school in connection with your union?

We have the West London District Schools at Ashford which we send our children to.

4830. Do you board any out?

We board out every single orphan and deserted child that we receive; we never send them to the district school, or only for a very short time. We have at this present moment 86 children boarded out, against 193 in the district schools at Ashford; 26, 11, and 9 in the three different Roman Catholic schools; and 22 on board the “Exmouth” training ship. So that the proportion of our boarded-out children is considerable.

4831. They are boarded out, I suppose, under Committees at a distance from London?

Yes; about 60 of the 86 are boarded out under the supervision of the Reverend W. P. Trevelyan, brother of the late Sir Charles Trevelyan, who takes an immense interest in the subject, and indeed devotes his whole life to it. He has 60 of our children; about seven or eight are Roman Catholics, and are boarded out on Lord Peter’s estate in Essex, and a number of others under Mrs. Charles Buxton at Fox Warren in Surrey.

4832. Have you any in what are termed Certified Schools?

We have just a few in places like the Home for Deaf and Dumb Children in Victoria-park-square., and the Roman Catholic School for the Blind, Liverpool.

4833. As far as you have been able to ascertain the results, are you well satisfied with the results of the boarding out?

Very well indeed. The children turn out very well. The girls go to service usually; many of the boys when they are 12 years old, if they are fit for it, we send to the “Exmouth,” which we consider a most excellent institution.

4834. Some witnesses are of opinion that the congregation of large numbers of children in district schools has many disadvantages; do you share that opinion?

I certainly do. The district schools are far too large; the children become mere machines. I think it was a great pity that they were started in such a hurry, as it were; no doubt it was necessary, particularly in the east-end of London at the time, some 20 years ago I believe, to separate the children from the workhouses; but I think it was done in much too wholesale a way; and certainly, speaking
speaking for our union, it has been a great misfortune and a great expense, and no advantage, as far as I know, sending them down to these district schools.

4835. You think that the training in such large institutions is not well suited to fit them for their employment afterwards?

That it makes the children into mere machines is the objection we find to it. For instance a child leaves the school at the age of 12 or 13, and cannot tell the time by the clock, and thinks that the water that runs down automatically for it to wash with has something to do with the rain that comes down from heaven, and ridiculous mistakes of that kind we have found the children make. They are absolutely ignorant of anything that goes on outside these schools.

4836. We had some evidence with regard to the establishment of cottage homes in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, where 25 or 30 children are placed together under a suitable matron; would you think that that would be a preferable system to district schools?

I should think it would be much better so far as I am able to judge; but I have never visited places of the kind.

4837. It is impossible of course to board out all the children, because many of them only pass through the hands of the guardians for a short time?

You can only board out orphans or deserted children.

4838. Therefore, some arrangement for schools must be provided?

You must have some institution of a scholastic description undoubtedly. Might I mention the way in which the children are admitted into these schools?

4839. If you please?

The Local Government Board only allow us to send these children once a fortnight. The reason is that they are afraid that the children may take some infection down with them, and they think that a fortnight's isolation is necessary to show that they are not infected. But the practical result is this: the vicious and bad parents, who do not wish their children to go to school, know the day on which we admit to the school, and the result is that on the morning they get discharged, and then they take the children out for the day, perhaps only for a few hours, and return at night, and the children go on for another fortnight in our workhouse. The result is that we have children in our workhouse who have never been to these schools at all. We have the power of sending them just outside to the board school, so they learn something; but in their case we lose all the benefit of these district schools, and we lose the allowance from the common fund that we should get if they were at the school. We do not understand why the Local Government Board insist upon this proceeding for the Protestant schools, and not for the Roman Catholic schools. Roman Catholic children we are allowed to send out the very day they are admitted; and we wish very much that that could be applied to Protestant children also; in fact, we are in communication with the Local Government Board on the subject now. We understand that their medical adviser, Dr. Bridges, is very strong on the subject, and will not relax this rule; still we hope he may see his way to do so. It is an immense expense; we consider that it costs us 500 l. a year, and it does the children an immense deal of harm.

4840. Would it not be sufficient if a careful medical examination was made of every child and it was certified to be a fit and proper subject for the school?

Those on our Board who have medical knowledge think so.

4841. You have, I suppose, a separate infirmary?

We have.

4842. Have you found that with the improvements, which I doubt not have been introduced into your infirmary of late years, the number of sick poor has increased?

They have rather increased in number, but it arises from the fact that we at first only put the acutely sick into the infirmary. The last year or two from (70.) 3 y 3 pressure
pressure we have put into the infirmary people who were not so acutely sick and who might have been treated in the workhouse. Considering that it costs 7s. a week in the infirmary and only 4s. in the workhouse, we keep all in the workhouse that we can, all that the doctor will allow us.

4843. Have you any dispensary in connection with your Board?
   Yes, there is a dispensary, but it is not a very important institution.

4844. Have you any special rules with regard to the granting of medical relief?
   No, I do not think that we can be said to have any special rules. We do not allow the doctors to order nourishment as a matter of course. If they recommend nourishment we consider the question apart from their order.

4845. In some unions we have heard that it is the practice to give the medical relief on loan; have you done that?
   We have never done that; it has been discussed, but we have never done it.

4846. Is there much alcohol administered in your union?
   No; in our infirmary there is next to none. It is not at our order in particular, but our doctor considers that alcohol is the most objectionable thing to give to people in this class of life; and I believe that as a matter of fact only some 5l. a year is spent in alcohol. We all thoroughly agree with his treatment, but we do not attempt to interfere with him at all.

4847. It has been suggested that the infirmary has become so important now that it might be desirable to admit clinical students; has your board ever considered that?
   We have not specially considered it. My own opinion coincides with what I saw Miss Twining said here before your Lordships' Committee.

4848. Namely?
   That it might very well be done. Some people think that the poor would object to it; but I believe that it might be done in such a way as to make it unobjectionable.

4849. To turn to another matter: have you any co-operation between charitable societies and the Board of Guardians in your union?
   The Charity Organisation is extremely well worked in our union, and many members of the Board of Guardians are active members of the Charity Organisation Committee, and also of the Society for the Relief of Distress. I myself work at both those societies.

4850. Do you refer cases to those societies which you think are not fit subjects for relief from the rates.
   Whether we think that or not, we refer cases very often. Every week cases are sent because the Charity Organisation Society can make much more elaborate inquiries with regard to their antecedents, and they can give them things that of course guardians cannot give.

4851. I think you have some evidence you would desire to offer as regards pensions?
   Although we have not a large number of pensioners in our workhouse, still if we find out that a man is receiving a pension from a private source (that is to say not an Army or Navy pension) we have under the present state of the law a great difficulty, and in fact it is impossible to attach that pension by any legal process. Therefore, the man will go out once every three months and draw his, perhaps, 1l. or 2l., and so on, and spend it in amusing himself, and then come back again, and we get no benefit from it. There is at present no legal process, which we think there might be, for going before a magistrate and swearing that this man is receiving a pension, and getting an order, in the same way that we get an order for the Military and Naval pensions.

4852. Of course you refer to a pension to which the man is legally entitled, not one given voluntarily?
   I mean
I mean if he is legally entitled to it. Many large firms have pension funds that men subscribe to, and when they become afterwards inmates of workhouses we have no power of coming upon those funds. With reference to a question which was put to me earlier in my evidence (No. 4785) with regard to in-door relief, I find that in the Christmas week of 1872 there were 1,599 inmates; in the Christmas week of 1873 there were 1,903; in the same week of 1874 there were 1,844; at the same time last year there were 2,158; and at this present moment there are 2,255.

4853. How are the able-bodied men employed in your workhouse?
In a variety of different ways; in fact almost in as many ways as I was reading that Mr. Vallance explained to you. We have taken a great many suggestions from the Whitechapel Union. The Chairman of the Board and myself went down some years ago, and Mr. Vallance was good enough to show us all over the place, and show us what he had invented for the people to do, a variety of different things; and with the exception of mat-making, I think we employ the people in all the same things that the Whitechapel Board of Guardians employ them in.

4854. Is there any oakum picking?
Yes, there is oakum picking, and stone breaking, and we do not think that in our Union we could dispense with that, because for these professional loafers and idlers it is the only test work. It is degrading no doubt, we do not see how we could possibly dispense with it.

4855. We are told that in Birmingham they have established a separate test house for able-bodied men of the description to which you have been alluding, where they are put to labour of this kind, and that that has been found to be very effective in diminishing the number of applicants; should you be in favour of such a system?
Certainly. At the present moment we have only four able-bodied inmates at the Kensington Workhouse, Mary-place, Notting-hill. We have an arrangement with them by which we can send in any number, and in a month we have 20 or 30 sometimes.

4856. And there they are put to labour of that kind?
They are put most strictly to work, and we find it a most efficient test.

4857. Earl of Aberdeen.] With regard to the District Schools, you spoke of some of the drawbacks which in your opinion attach to that system; would you agree then with some remarks made by a former witness, Mr. Sherrard, who said, speaking of the children of these schools (at No. 2828): "Of course I am aware that there are exceptions to every rule; but as a rule I find that the children are dull and that they are wanting in intelligence, and that they have no practical knowledge whatever of life; that they are brought up together in large masses, and they have no practical training; therefore, they have no self-reliance, and are not fitted to battle with the outside world at all, and it is especially bad for the girls."

Well, I think that is rather a sweeping statement to make. In the first place Mr. Sherrard has never been a manager of the schools.

4858. I want to know whether you agree with the terms of the answer, rather than whether you think he was qualified to give the answer?
I agree with some of the things he says, but I think he goes a great deal too far in depreciation of the training that the children receive at the schools. When a child is admitted at the age of two and kept in the school till 14 years of age, as many of the children are from the Fulham Union (we do not adopt that plan); no doubt it does become dull and absolutely unacquainted with the outside life, as I was saying just now, not knowing the time by the clock even.

4859. And such instances as imagining that the water in the tap comes straight down from the clouds?
(70.)
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Yes; I think, if I might add it, that it is rather an abuse of this school to take these orphan children in when they are two years old and to keep them there till they are 14. We do not use the school in that way, because we heard those children out.

4860. Then Mr. Sherrard spoke of the difficulty in getting mistresses who receive girls from these schools to retain them in their employment?

I do not think that that is so; I should say that Mr. Sherrard was under a mistake. I have the figures here of the statistics of girls under the care of the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants from the West London District Schools, classified. On the 31st December 1885 there are: very good, 49; fairly good, 27; unsatisfactory, 13; bad, five; then, married, one; dead, two; unfit for service, two; visits refused (that means that they cannot find out anything about them), two; lost or not traced, three; with relations, six. That makes altogether 110 for the year ending the 31st December 1885. Similar figures for 1886, show that there were 62 very good out of 102, and only five bad; and in December 1887 there were 61 very good, and only two bad, out of 90. So that those figures, which are vouched for by this society (and no doubt your Lordships know the society; those figures are given to me by Miss Bramston one of our Lady Guardians), show most satisfactory results, quite as good as in ordinary life; better, I should say.

4861. Can you tell us how these reports are compiled; I mean how the information is obtained as to the conduct of the children after they leave the schools?

I am not very well versed in what these ladies do, but I believe a lady is told off as soon as a child is admitted to its first place, and then she goes when she likes, and endeavours to make friends with the mistress, and she talks to the child and sees her. But I am not speaking from my own knowledge; I am not a member of the society myself.

4862. I know it is a very admirable society, and we may presume that these returns would not have been issued by that society without careful inquiry?

I have not the slightest doubt that they have been carefully made.

4863. Are you one of the managers of the West London District Schools?

Yes.

4864. Then, speaking generally, would you say that there have not been more cases of girls failing in conduct from these schools than you would expect to find in any collective body?

Speaking from the returns of this society to which I have just referred (I could not speak from my own knowledge in any way), I should say that the girls turn out extremely well; quite as well as they do in ordinary life.

4865. Mr. Sherrard also said (in No. 2887) in speaking of the subject: I am bound to say that all the guardians (of Paddington that is) "have not the same very strong objection that I have to the district schools," but he went on to observe that a resolution had been passed which appeared to indicate that the guardians would have been glad to get rid of the schools if they had the opportunity of doing so; does that tally with your knowledge of boards of guardians?

I believe that the Paddington Guardians would like to get rid of the school, and so would our guardians, if we could by any possibility get out of the schools without an enormous pecuniary loss. Of course if we got rid of the school we should have to start other schools, and I think we should be scarcely justified in incurring the expense that would be involved. We have the schools and endeavour to make the best of them.

4866. How many are there in the school altogether?

The school is big enough to accommodate 800 odd; I think at the present moment there are about 620. We have 193 in it.

4867. Then
4867. Then with reference to the opinion that you gave in answer to the noble Earl in the Chair as to the drawbacks that seem to attach to these schools, how would you propose to remedy those drawbacks, or remove them?
I do not know that you could remedy them in the existing schools. I should have preferred to have had much smaller schools, and then I do not think those drawbacks would have arisen.

4868. Are you in favour of the Cottage Home system?
So far as I know about the cottage homes, I think I am; but I do not know enough to be able to give a definite opinion.

4869. Chairman.] I understand that your objection is principally to the overgrown size of the district schools rather than to the management?
Yes; they are far too large, and that prevents individuality with reference to the children.

4870. Earl of Aberdeen.] That tallies with the general experience which is often expressed?
I think it is the opinion of most people.

4871. And as to boarding out, would you agree with the statement made by the same witness, Mr. Sherrard, when he said that he would like to see larger powers given to the guardians by law to enable them to deal with pauper children, not only those who are orphans or deserted?
I do not think it would be possible to board out any children except they are orphans or deserted; because the foster parents would have no guarantee that they would be able to keep them; the real parents would have a right to intervene and take them away.

4872. I understand that Mr. Sherrard was referring to cases of children of vicious parents who perhaps make no objection to their children being in the workhouse when young, but wish to retain control over them when they are old enough to earn money, perhaps by begging or malpractices?
That would involve an immense change in the whole law of the land. It might be desirable, or it might not; but at the present time a parent has absolute power over his children till they are 16 years of age; and it would be too large a question, I think, to deal with.

4873. Then as to another regulation, the regulation that children cannot be boarded out under two or over ten years of age; do you think that there is any inconvenience in that?
The Local Government Board almost allow a child over 18 months to be boarded out on special application. We have often boarded out children as young as 18 months; in fact there are many reasons in favour of that, because the foster mother gets fonder of the child if she has had to carry it about as though it were her own child when it was very small. I do not think that an older limit of age than ten would be desirable.

4874. Is there any discretion allowed by the Local Government Board in that respect also; as to going above the age on special application?
We have never made an application to board out a child over ten as far as I remember; I should think it would not be desirable.

4875. As to the causes of the poverty which during recent years has occasionally been manifested, I want to ask you whether you agree with the answer given by Mr. Sherrard to a question (No. 2845) as to the causes for it: "I think the first grand cause is to be found in the improvidence of the working classes. The working classes, as a rule, will spend what they earn; whatever wages a man earns he feels justified in spending that, and then that is spent for the most part in the public-house, and that, of course, acts and re-acts," and so on; do you agree with that?
I think certainly improvidence and drink is the cause of an immense quantity of the poverty of this country.

4876. Have you any suggestions to make as to possible measures of encouraging thrift amongst the poor?
No particular suggestions.
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4877. Of course it is important to influence the children?  
Certainly, it is very desirable that every effort should be made to save the children from being contaminated and corrupted when they are young; and I have no doubt, as years go on, there will be less of that professional class in consequence of the efforts that are made now to educate the children.

4878. One question about the powers of the guardians as regards emigration: would you like to see any further power given generally to the guardians in that matter?
I do not exactly know what their present powers are.

4879. Will you kindly state the practice of your board of guardians with reference to emigrating paupers?
It has been a very unusual thing for our board of guardians to emigrate paupers. I have known one or two instances since I have been a guardian. As far as I remember, one was the case of a widow with two children; I cannot remember for certain, what the other cases, if they existed, were.

4880. From the same witness to whom I have referred, we had the statement (at No. 2810) that in his judgment: "Indiscriminate out-door relief, or anything approaching to indiscriminate out-door relief, is to be condemned in the most unmeasured terms possible, as it impoverishes and degrades the recipients, and is doing a very great injustice to the ratepayers;" do you agree with that?
The I entirely agree with that.

4881. He went on afterwards to say that under a strict and careful supervision out-door relief was occasionally desirable; do you agree with that?
I think that the alteration in the law that I should like to see made would be to prohibit out-door relief being given permanently. If it could be restricted, I should say, myself, to a month, but say three months with regard to any case, I should think it might in many cases, a case of recent widowhood for instance, be a very desirable thing. I should be sorry to see out-door relief done away with entirely, but I should like to see it restricted in the length of time; I think that the permanent cases are objectionable.

4882. Would you draw any distinction between out-door relief in kind and in money?
That entirely depends upon the character of the recipient. You would never give money to a person you cannot trust, or if you have doubts of their sobriety. We always give money when we can trust the people.

4883. Do you agree with the opinion which has been expressed by some gentlemen as to there being a much greater objection to out-door relief in money than in kind?
I think it depends upon the character of the recipients. If they can be trusted with money they can make money go further than the kind you give them.

4884. Chairman.] Would you see any serious objection to applying the Prohibitory Order to your union; that is to say, preventing out-door relief entirely to able-bodied persons, leaving a power to give out-door relief either to widows, who are excepted from the Prohibitory Order, if I remember rightly, or, of course, to those who are not able-bodied?
If out-door relief could be restricted as to time I should like it to remain under the present order that we now go under, which is the London order, not the Prohibitory Order.

4885. You would prefer to have still a discretionary power in some cases to give out relief to able-bodied persons?
Yes, if it could be restricted in point of time; but I would rather have the Prohibitory Order if the law is to remain as it is.

4886. Why do you think that a union such as yours differs so much from a rural union that what can be easily, and most people think advantageously, enforced
enforced in the one case could not be advantageously enforced in the other; what is the difference, in your opinion?

Taking the applicants for relief in London, it is impossible to get at the facts of their history. In the country you know all about the applicants; probably you have known them all your life. Then, besides, the guardians change very much in a London union. Each year there is a tremendous parochial contest, and it turns on all sorts of different questions; consequently you get a different board of guardians; and in the unions where there are a very few ex-officios, who are permanent, you might have quite a different set of men and a different set of principles each year.

4887. Surely those would rather be arguments in favour of the Prohibitory Order; because the Prohibitory Order does not leave a discretion to the guardians; consequently the argument would be the other way, would it not; but I only want your opinion upon it; we know that it has been a general opinion that the Prohibitory Order could not be enforced in London, for example, and I want to know whether you see any such great difference, from your experience, between a town union and the country that the Prohibitory Order is applicable in London?

I think that, if the Prohibitory Order was in force in London, there would be from time to time sensation meetings amongst ratepayers, when there was anything like what went on in Trafalgar-square; it would lead to a great deal more sensational talk. At the present time the guardians have the discretion, and that is always an answer to sensational people who think that a great deal more relief ought to be given to these people than is given.

4888. Earl of Aberdeen.] I gather that your board have not paid special attention to the question of whether assistance for the purpose of emigration ought to be given to paupers?

As a matter of fact, we know that we can emigrate people. We have only, in the 16 years I have been a guardian, so far as I can tax my memory, done it twice.

4889. What is the reason that the board do not look with favour upon emigration?

I do not think it is correct to say that they do not look with favour on it. As a matter of fact we do not often emigrate people; I cannot exactly say why; there is no particular reason. If an application was made by any ratepayer to the board of guardians, and he show that it would be a good thing to emigrate a person, I do not think we should refuse to do so; in fact, I individually should be very much in favour of doing so in many cases.

4890. Application has not been made to the guardians for assistance in that?

It is not the fashion to relieve in that way. It has not been objected to.

4891. Chairman.] You have not considered it specially?

No.

4892. Probably if you came to consider it you would have to consider the probability that, if you removed a number of people at the expense of the rates, an equivalent number of people would come in to supply the vacuum?

Certainly; that applies particularly to our union.

4893. Referring again to the question that I put to you concerning the district schools, I understood you to say that you thought that Mr. Sherrard’s remarks upon the effect on the girls were not borne out by the reports you have received, and that therefore you could not assent to the remarks that he made as to his fear that many of the girls went wrong?

I think that is quite incorrect; in fact, those figures which I have put in show that we know as a fact that they do not go wrong; that they have not gone wrong.
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4894. At No. 2828 he says: "The mistresses are dissatisfied, and they get discharged, and then many of them, I am afraid, go wrong." He is referring to girls who get discharged?

I think that is quite incorrect.

4895. If girls are discharged, they would not come under the notice of the guardians or the association after that, would they?

Yes, they come under the association.

4896. After they are discharged?

If they get discharged from their first place, which they very often do, as not being fit for the place, then the association take them up, and they have homes where they keep them for several weeks, and get them another place, or put them to something that they are better suited for.

4897. Mr. Sherrard, then, expressed there an apprehension which apparently was not well founded?

Quite so.

4898. Earl of Strafford.] You mentioned that a good many of the children in the union that are boarded out are under the care of the Rev. W. P. Trevelyan; is that in Northumberland?

At Calverton, in Buckinghamshire.

4899. Are they all together in one village?

No, in five or six different villages. I have been round with him on several occasions to see them in their different cottages. He is the centre of the nucleus, so to speak. I think they have three boarding-out committees there.

4900. How many children are boarded out in that way?

Sixty out of our 85 are under his supervision.

4901. And does Mr. Trevelyan make a report occasionally to the board of guardians?

Periodically, at least once a quarter; when, in fact, he applies for the money.

4902. Has he a committee of ladies or any residents to help him?

Yes; the Local Government Board insist upon that; there are very stringent regulations laid down.

4903. I may gather from your evidence on that point that St. George’s, Hanover-square, Board of Guardians are quite satisfied with the condition of the boarded-out children?

Very much so.

4904. And you approve of the system yourself?

Very much so. I think nothing could be more desirable in the case of orphans and deserted children.

4905. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] In the early part of your evidence you said that people applying for relief whose destitution was the result of intemperance and improvidence should be expected to enter the workhouse?

Yes.

4906. Have you any practical way of defining the expressions, "intemperance" and "improvidence"?

We take the report from the relieving officer; those would be two of the first things that he would make inquiries about.

4907. Of course they are terms of quantity as well as quality?

We do not expect people to be teetotalers; we merely expect them to bear the character about the place of not being of drunken habits.

4908. In fact, with regard to those two points, you must take the word of the relieving officer; you act on his opinion?

Yes; we act on the result of his inquiries.

4909. You
4909. You spoke about certain doles being given to people and being withdrawn; do you think that when they are withdrawn they are made up from other sources, or that they have to go without them altogether? I used the word "doles" with regard to this half-a-crown a week that we allow the old people. We do not often strike it off. If we once put an old or infirm person on to the list of recipients of, say, half-a-crown a week, it is never struck off unless the person is reported for some action of insubordination or impropriety. It would go on practically for the whole of their lives; it depends upon each individual case whether it is struck off.

4910. Have you an infirmary in the country distinct from the workhouse in London? Our infirmary is an adjoining building; it is entirely separate; we have no other infirmary.

4911. But it is in the metropolis?
In the Fulham-road, adjoining the workhouse.

4912. You spoke about your not having the power of withdrawing from persons who came upon the rates the amount of public pensions that they receive? Private pensions, I said. We have no difficulty in dealing with the Army and Navy pensions. It is where persons have a private pension, and we know they have.

4913. It is not in your discretion to refuse them relief?
They go out and draw this pound, we will say, and spend it in about a day, and then they are destitute, and in that case they are legally entitled to relief.

4914. And you are helpless?
We are helpless. What we should like is a power of stopping them, and using them as we use the military and naval pensions, in aid of their maintenance.

4915. You have no power of ascertaining the source of these private pensions, so as to communicate with the people.
We have never done that.

4916. Chairman.] I rather understand your difficulty to be that you have not the power of attaching the pension after you have ascertained it?
That is so; we have no power of attaching it.

4917. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] You complain of the size of the district schools; I suppose the size of them is simply a matter of economy?
That I do not know; I think not. I think if they had been originally built smaller it would have been much better. They were built, I believe, on the advice of Mr. Tufnell, then the poor law inspector, of this enormous size, in order to entirely dissociate them from the workhouse. The idea was that there would be no objection to having them large if they were in the country, and completely separate from the workhouse, to do away with the pauper taint; but I think that that has not worked out so satisfactorily in consequence of their size. I do not think it was foreseen.

4918. But apart from the original cost of the building, I suppose the cost per head of the children where there is a large number would be considerably smaller than where there is a small number?
No, I do not think it would. If we were allowed to have our 193 children in a separate school, I think we could have built a school which would accommodate 200 children, and they would not have cost more per head than they do now. These children cost 30 l. a head; that is the average price.

4919. Where there are 700 of them?
Where there are 700 of them. Our schools, I am sorry to say, are the most expensive of the district schools. That arises from a variety of reasons. We had an unfortunate law suit about the building of them; we had to borrow money to pay the law costs, and so on.
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4920. Do
4920. Do you object altogether to the district schools? I do not object to the principle of clubbing together the children from various unions; I merely object to the size of the schools.

4921. Then I need not ask you what substitute you propose for them? If we could begin afresh, I should say that each union should have a school for its own children, I think 200 children in a school is quite enough, instead of 800. I believe in the Hanwell schools they have 1,200.

4922. You spoke about the ignorance and the helplessness of children in these large district schools; surely that is remediable by more superintendence and better teaching methods, although, of course, that involves more expense? Yes, of course it would involve a great deal more expense; and these children are not like children in ordinary schools; they have no holidays or parents, or brothers and sisters, to go to. I am speaking of the orphans, the children that we heard out, and whom certain unions send to these district schools. The remark applies more especially to these orphans who go in at the age of two and go out at 13 or 14, and never have been outside the walls of their school once during the whole of that time.

4923. Any amount of ignorance on the part of London children is quite conceivable and intelligent to me, from what I know of them; but I should have thought that such instances as you give might easily have been prevented by a little intelligent teaching on the part of the masters and mistresses: I do not say that such ignorance might not be prevented; I only mention as a fact that it is one of the results. Possibly it might be prevented, but I think you would have to have a great many more schoolmistresses and schoolmasters; and it would be very much more expensive.

4924. Of course that is in favour of your argument as to the expense of the district school? It is so very expensive at present that we should not feel justified in going into any further expense.

4925. Earl of Hopetoun.] You expressed your opinion that we might abolish the casual wards, and that the class which are now taken into the casual wards should be received into the workhouse, and you said that they probably would dislike the workhouse more than they do the casual ward; do you not think that that would increase the number of people sleeping out in the streets? I think that is a matter for the police. I think it is most improper to allow them to sleep in the streets. I believe it is an offence, a misdemeanour, for anyone to sleep in the streets, and I think the police ought to be much more strict about it.

4926. If there was no casual ward which they could be taken to, what would happen to them? The police would bring them to the workhouse; that is what I wish.

4927. Not to prison?
The police would deal with them according to their own rules; I do not know exactly what they would be.

4928. You mentioned the subject of oakum-picking, and you said that that was a necessary form of labour; can you tell me what amount of oakum an able-bodied man is supposed to pick in a day? Speaking off-hand, I think it is 6 lbs.; but I do not know that that conveys a very definite idea. I think it varies; I think a man is capable of picking as many as 8 lbs. I think it is 6 lbs. that he is required to pick, but I am not quite sure.

4929. Do you know that in prison an able-bodied man is only supposed to pick 3½ to 4 lbs.; it seems rather hard that a pauper should be made to pick more in the workhouse than criminals do in prison? Well, a pauper in the workhouse is supposed to be kept employed, if he is able
to work, all day; and I believe some men can pick 6-lbs., and I believe some men can pick as much as 8-lbs. I think they ought to be kept employed all day. As long as they are in the workhouse, I do not think they ought to be allowed to remain in idleness. No doubt a skilled picker could do much more than an unskilled one. Probably a prisoner who had never done it before (as is the case with many people who go into prison) would have a great difficulty in picking any at all. I have always understood that it is not an easy thing to do.

4930. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] It is not a very pleasant task?
I have never tried it myself, but some guardians have (very properly) tried it. The reason we introduced corn grinding is because it is much harder work, and more distasteful to the inmates.

4931. Earl of Hopetoun.] You mentioned with regard to the sick relief that the doctor considered alcohol very bad for people in that class of life?
I mean that a very large proportion of people who end their days in workhouses have got there from drunkenness; drunken habits. I believe medical opinions differ on these points very much; but our doctor does not consider that for the class of people that he has to deal with, alcohol is a suitable form of medicine; but I believe it is entirely a matter of opinion on which doctors differ very widely. I think that in the Chelsea Union they spend as much as 500 l. a year; but I will not say that for certain. They give there a large quantity of beer; in fact, we used to give a good deal of beer to people who did different work in the workhouse, but we have entirely given it up; we think it is undesirable.

4932. Lord Thring.] A witness who, like yourself, has told us of the great benefit of boarding out orphan and deserted children, suggested that the system ought to be extended by giving legal power to take away the children of vicious and intemperate parents, and make them legally the children of the State. Now do you, or do you not, coincide more or less with that opinion?
I think, if I might venture to say so, it is a larger question than I should care to give an answer to off-hand. It could not be confined to paupers; and I am only speaking about paupers in workhouses.

4933. I understood you to say that, instead of letting a pauper come and take his child out whenever he chooses, the State might, in the event of his being declared to be intemperate or otherwise unfit, have charge of the child, take possession of the child and board it out?
Of course we see, from day to day, these wretched children suffering from being dragged in and out by their parents; but I should be sorry to say off-hand that the children should be taken away. It would cut both ways; many parents would illtreat them in order to get rid of them.

4934. However, you have not attended to that particular point?
No. I should not like to give an answer on that subject off-hand.

4935. Earl of Onslow.] Should you be prepared to extend the system of boarding out beyond children to aged persons?
I think not, certainly not for people who are only aged and infirm; I think it would be a very cruel thing in London to take people away to workhouses 40 or 50 miles off where they would have no opportunity of ever seeing anybody they knew. That is a subject which we were actually discussing ourselves in our union this winter; because we were very hard up for space, and someone suggested that; and that seemed to me to be the answer to it. They always have every other Sunday out, the old and infirm who behave themselves pretty well; and of course if they were shifted down into the country they would be practically prisoners.

4936. You said you were in favour of abolishing the casual wards. If you were to abolish the casual wards altogether, what would become of the destitute honest wayfarer?
(70.)
I do not believe that he exists at the present moment; I have never seen a specimen of that class in the metropolis.

4937. Do you not believe that there is such a thing as an honest man going about the country seeking for work?

No. Of course it is rather a sweeping thing to say in that way, but certainly I have never come across a favourable instance.

4938. Chairman.] Would you not draw some distinction between London and the country. The class in London is almost entirely composed of professional beggars and tramps; but in the country it may be presumed that although a very large number of vagrants are of the professional class, there are some men who are moving from one part of the country to the other, and do desire to obtain work?

My remarks have been entirely confined to the metropolitan area. I will not say for a moment that there are not many people in the country districts who are not to a certain extent honest wayfarers.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. LIONEL LINDO ALEXANDER, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

4939. Chairman.] You are a member of the Jewish Board of Guardians?

I am a member of the Jewish Board of Guardians and honorary secretary to the Board.

4940. And what is the sphere of your action; what part of London does it extend over, the whole of it?

The whole of the metropolis.

4941. Have you a workhouse of your own?

No, we have no workhouse.

4942. How do you deal with cases as a rule; do you grant out-door relief or give orders for a workhouse?

We give no orders on any house; practically it amounts to out-door relief only, so far as our general relief is concerned.

4943. Have you an infirmary?

No, we have not.

4944. Then how do you deal with the sick poor?

The sick poor are either helped by us in their own homes, or else they go to the hospitals or to other institutions which exist amongst us.

4945. Of course, there must be cases where the homes are of such a nature that they cannot be properly attended to there. I suppose in those cases you are able to send them to some charitable institution?

Yes, we have other institutions amongst us.

4946. In granting out-door relief, have you any rules that you generally are guided by?

We have not a code of rules, but experience has furnished a set of rules, practically. Each case is really considered on its merits; and the great aim which we have is to help cases to help themselves.

4947. I will just take a series of cases, and ask you how you deal with each case. We will take the case of an able-bodied man, who is not ill, but applies to you on the ground that he is destitute, having no work; how do you deal with that case?

I take it you mean one who is temporarily out of work, but industrious?

4948. I took an able-bodied man simply; we will take first an industrious man?

Our first inquiry would be to see whether the man bore a good character, if not already known to us; whether he was an industrious man generally and
out of work from no fault of his own, thrown out of work in consequence of slackness or in consequence of ill-health. We should then determine, in our own minds, the exact reason why that man was not then finding employment, and should inquire into the probability of his finding quick employment again in the particular calling in which he had before been engaged. In the event of our seeing that it was very probable that he would again be able to find employment in that calling, we should perhaps make him a small allowance, or give him a small gift once and for ever, just to enable him to tide over the period of slackness; but if we decided that it was unlikely he would be able readily to find work again in that particular handicraft, we should strive then to place him in another employment; it might be that, having been a handicraftsman, we might think fit to give him a little capital whereby to commence some small business on his own account.

4949. Supposing he were a man of indifferent character, or could not be termed a deserving poor man, how would you deal with such a case as that?
Then, again, we should deal with that very much on its merits. We should, perhaps, have a great deal of commiseration if there happened to be a wife and a large family of children. In many instances, amongst the Jews, the wives do a very large amount towards the making of the home, and the earning of the money to keep it up. Even with large families they manage to scrape together a little bit here and there, in one fashion or another, and are able to earn something towards their livelihood. If the woman is an industrious woman, and there is a large family, we should have more commiseration for the man, even if he were undeserving, than if he had no wife or children to depend upon him. In the event of his wife being an industrious person, we should probably give him a little something in order that he might jog on, very likely in the same fashion as before.

4950. Supposing he was a drunken, profligate man, who beat his wife and neglected his children?
Then we should strive to set the wife up in some little business. We have, in very many cases, been able to provide the wife with a little business, whereby she could could maintain the family.

4951. But would you give the wife enough to maintain also the husband in that case?
She probably would. Our measure of relief would not be calculated for that purpose; but, if he were not very cruel to her, there is generally sufficient commiseration between the two for her to do something for him; but the relief aimed at would be for the wife and children, not the husband, if he were not of good character.

4952. Supposing the man had no wife?
Then we should do nothing for him. We should give him one or two chances. We might do something for him the first time, but if we found it a hopeless case we should do nothing for him.

4953. Suppose he came again and again?
We should abandon him, certainly.

4954. What would become of him?
He might probably go to the workhouse; but we do not find that many cases do.

4955. In fact, such cases, when they do occur, would be left by you to the operation of the ordinary law; the man would have to apply to the authorities and be dealt with accordingly; you would have nothing more to do with him?
Yes, precisely; but we do not go to that extent unless we have made every effort that we possibly can to reclaim the man.

4956. It would operate as a check upon some bad cases, and cases of imposture?
There is distinctly no bolstering up of bad cases on our part, but a great effort to reclaim them.

4957. To go from that to the case of an able-bodied man out of work from temporary sickness; what do you do in that case?
(70.)
We should calculate the time which would probably elapse before he could go again into work, and if we found he was a respectable man, and his wife was respectable, and he had conducted himself decently, we should very likely make an allowance, renewable at the end of a fortnight, till he was in physical condition to go back to work.

4958. How much would you grant to a man and his wife and four children, the wife earning nothing, and the man being out of work?

 Probably we might allow the man 10 s. or 15 s. a week for a fortnight.

4959. Now, take the case of the aged and infirm; in what way are they dealt with. Take two classes of cases; take first aged and infirm people who can earn a little, but not enough to support themselves; and then aged and infirm people not able to earn anything.

As to those who are able to earn something, or have a little something which they get from friends, those who require an addition to what they have of certain income, to them we allow permanent allowances varying from 2 s. 6 d. to 10 s. a week approximately; there might be one or two getting a little bit more than that; but approximately from 2 s. 6 d. to 10 s. a week; and that they have so long as they behave themselves properly.

4960. And with regard to those unable to do anything for themselves, how do you deal with them?

For those that are absolutely unable to do anything for themselves, being still good characters, our measure of permanent allowance would be a little bit larger; but we try if possible to get those people something from one of the other institutions where they can be placed in a home, or else a small gift from some other pension society in addition to our small gifts; because there are many pension societies amongst the Jews for aged and infirm people.

4961. If the people are bad characters, what then?

If they are bad characters they have practically to rely on their friends; we do not give to those who have been leading a vicious life.

4962. Now, another class, that of widows with children; in the first place, do you generally require, what it is the practice, we are told, in most unions in London to require, a widow who is able-bodied to support two children; is that the rule of your Board?

I do not know that I could put it in those words; I think, practically, the result would be that.

4963. Then, putting those cases out of the view, we will take the case of a widow who has four or five children, and cannot possibly support more than one or two of them; how do you deal with such cases as those?

That is a case in which we find some hardship. I know that Gentiles in such cases are enabled, when the case is respectable, to get the parish to take one or two of the children, say, and to place them in the district school.

4964. That is so?

With us, that sort of relief is not possible, and it is a pity, I think, that it is not so, for this reason. The district school is naturally not prepared to receive the children of the Jewish faith, because the dietary requirements do not exist there, and the education which is necessary for them to be brought up in the Jewish faith, likewise does not exist, so that in that case we cannot partake of that portion of the parochial relief which I think we largely should avail ourselves of if it were to be had. What we really do then is to take up the cases of such widows and run them in by election to our Orphan Asylum.

4965. Have you never thought it expedient to establish a district or certified school of your own for Jewish children?

We do not find that we have had enough of them. There are two classes of children for whom we have no special provision. One class is that which I just mentioned, and the other is the pauper children, which probably your Lordship will come to, what I call the children of absolute paupers, which class with us generally consists of deserted children, children deserted by their parents. Likewise in that case the children of Gentiles would be sent, I take it,
it, to the district school; whereas we cannot avail ourselves of that. That is even a greater hardship for us; because though we would be willing to make an effort to get the children of respectable widows into our Orphan Asylum by election or by the Pauper Removal Act, yet we are not inclined to lower the level of our orphan school, which contains children of a better class, by admitting the children of paupers, that being the only available and certified school for us to pass them into. To us it would be a very great advantage if arrangement could be made by which specially the children of paupers, or deserted children, could be passed into the district schools, and not forced into a certified school of a better class.

4966. Would there be any difficulty in your establishing what is known as Cottage Homes, where not more than 25 or 30 children are placed, and which we are told is one of the best methods of dealing with orphans and deserted children?

That may be the case; but our theory rather is that if such an establishment existed to-day, we should fill it to-morrow with the 30 children you mention; but so long as it does not exist, I think it is a very great check upon desertion. Now we know that parents very frequently desert their children, permit them to go into the workhouse, simply hoping that the Jewish Board of Guardians will put the necessary machinery in motion for removing those children to our Orphan Asylum at Norwood, under the provisions of the Pauper Removal Act; whereas the good-for-nothing parents would never have the chance of getting their children into that establishment by election; and we are inclined to think that it is dangerous to establish such a home, because it would in its nature tend, we think, to increase desertion.

4967. If you are not in favour, for the reasons you have stated, of establishing such homes for orphan and deserted children, I should apprehend that you would be still more averse to what has been suggested by some witnesses; exercising the power, if it were given you, of taking children away from parents who are vicious, and bringing them up at your expense.

I should personally be very much opposed to that.

4968. You think that would lead to a considerable number of what are called vicious parents deserting their children, and putting them upon you to support?

I should go further, and say it would be the means of breeding vice in the parents.

4969. How do you administer medical relief?

The medical relief is now administered to the Jewish poor by the parishes, but differently from the way in which the Gentiles receive it to a certain extent; and for this reason: your Lordships probably know that there is a tendency on the part of most of the parishes, certainly those which we have any knowledge of, when considerable nourishments are required by the patients, to drive the people into the House to have those nourishments; because they think, and rightly think, that if they give out a certain amount of nourishments to be taken home to the patient, those nourishments do not entirely go to the patient, but get divided among the family, and therefore a great portion of the medicine is lost in that way. But with us it is different, because we arrange with all the medical officers of the parishes in which the poor Jews reside that they shall give orders for all nourishments that are required for medical and surgical cases; those orders presented at our Board are always honoured, and these nourishments are found for the people.

4970. Could you tell me what is the number of persons you relieve?

I have the exact numbers.

4971. Have you the statistics for more than one year?

I have brought up a little epitome of our relief in the past year; I will hand it in (handing in the same, vide Appendix). It is simply an epitome of some of the figures in the report.

(70.)
4972. I find from this that in the year 1887 you had 3,415 cases, representing about 11,600 persons who applied for relief, and that assistance was granted to about 92 per cent. of them:
This being exclusive of the industrial and loan departments.

4973. That permanent allowances were given to cases of old age, infirmity, and incurable disease; that in 1887 these were paid to 176 families, at a cost of over 1,700 l.; besides which you have an industrial department, which issues implements on loan, apprentices youths, and so forth.
Yes.

4974. Is it an increasing number that you have applying for relief, or have you less than formerly?
I think in 1887 the numbers were somewhat less than in 1886; but it is a varying number. The tendency during the last seven years, say, for instance, has been to an increase.

4975. But do you think it is an increase absolutely, or only an increase owing to the increasing number of the population you deal with?
I do not think it is an increase in pauperism.

4976. Do you think that you have an increase in poverty, or that it is, on the whole, stationary, or declining?
I think, distinctly, there has been a decrease in condition within the last two or three years; that is to say, the slackness of trade, which did not quite at first affect the Jews, has affected them more within the last two years.

4977. I think I may conclude from this paper that you have no labour yard.
We have no labour yard.

4978. You have a workroom where girls are trained to useful employment?
Yes.

4979. Are those girls persons who are receiving relief from your board, or is it a charitable institution, simply for any girls?
No; the ordinary relief which we may give to a family might be the apprenticing of the girl to our workroom, or it might be a case where the father gets some other relief from the board.

4980. Also you advance loans of money for the purposes of trade. That might be rather regarded as charitable assistance than as coming under the category of Poor Law?
They pay absolutely no interest for it; otherwise there is no charity in it. They have to pay back the whole amount by small instalments, sixpence in the £ per week, and find sureties for the repayment.

4981. You also assisted, I observe, 568 families, comprising 1,147 individuals, in 1887, to emigrate, at a cost of over 1,300 l.; were those families with children, or able-bodied persons?
They were all people either desiring to leave these shores to join friends, or with prospects elsewhere, or else they were hopeless cases which had striven to get on here, and not being able to get on here were sent back home to the Continent by us.

4982. Have you any arrangement for establishing these people in the countries to which they go, or for following them up and knowing what becomes of them?
We issue to each emigrant a paper to be filled up affording us information of what becomes of them; but very few of those papers are returned. We give them to them when they go away.

4983. Where do most of your emigrants go?
To the United States; some to Canada, a few to Australia, and a few to the Cape; but very few.

4984. I suppose
4984. I suppose you have also a not inconsiderable immigration to deal with?
We have.

4985. Has that increased of late years?
In 1886, yes; in 1887 there was a decrease.

4986. Do you think that the Mansion House Fund had anything to do with the increase?
I am quite sure that the Mansion House Fund was attractive in its nature, and did bring the people over here; it brought a very large number of imposters. In distributing that portion of the Mansion House Fund which was handed to the Board to be given to the Jews (it was arranged with the committee of that fund that the relief to Jews should be entirely in the hands of my Board), we relieved for the purposes of trade only; almost all the money was given for the purchase of goods for trading purposes, or for the buying of tools where a man’s implements of trade were not ample, or in some such form as that; but, practically, every sixpence was spent for the purposes of trade.

4987. Have you taken any steps at any time to check the immigration?
We have taken every possible step to check the immigration, and I think we have been very successful in that respect. We have issued abroad very widespread warnings. We have had working with us about 30 continental congregations who have striven to keep the people back, en route, while wandering hither.

4988. On the whole, have you a continuous increase of the Jewish population in London?
Yes.

4989. Has it been marked of late years?
A greater congestion took place in 1886, but that disappeared in 1887.

4990. May I ask in what part of London the greater portion of your community reside, the poor?
The East-end of London.

4991. You give a good deal of your relief, I think, on loan?
We do; a considerable portion. I could tell you the exact figure we gave on loan last year; about 3,000 £ was repayable by the recipients; some by way of loan in the form of money loans, and some in the form of apprenticeship fees.

4992. Now, looking at your system as a whole, as you have described it, it can hardly be regarded, can it, as a mere administration of relief under the provisions of our Poor Law; but it is a combination, as it were, of that with an extensive system of charity?
I think that precisely describes what it is.

4993. I should be glad to know what, in your opinion, and the opinion of your Board, has been the effect of their administration. I have no doubt it relieves distress; does it tend, do you think, to increase pauperism in your community, or the contrary. Fully believing that you succeed in relieving distress, but looking at the other side of the question, do you think that your system tends to increase the pauperism in your community?
Quite the reverse; I think it tends to remove it, and very rapidly, because I think I am perfectly right in saying (I am speaking from memory now) that considerably more than one-half of the people who come to us in any one year disappear, and we never see them again.

4994. Of course, the usual view is this: that if out-door relief such as you dispense is easily obtainable; it tends to discourage thrift; that men, thinking that, at all events, they will be assisted if they fall into difficulties, do not save money either for sickness or old age; or, again, that, if they obtain high wages in one part of the year, they do not lay by any portion of those wages, trusting that in the slack times they will be supported by other people. Do you think that those considerations have affected your community?
(70.)
I think that is quite right as a theory, but I do not think it is applicable to us, because I do not consider that we give any reasonable measure of out-door relief, except in cases where it can do not only temporary but permanent good.

4995. What I infer from you is this: that you are in no way favourable to what may be termed doles for enabling people to live, but that your object is to give assistance by which they may be enabled to support themselves as far as possible?

Precisely; we try to give ample succour.

4996. But still you are confronted necessarily with this difficulty: that there are a certain number of cases of old and infirm people where it is no longer possible, by any means, to enable them to earn their living; but you do not think that you are burdened with cases which otherwise would not come to charity, owing to persons in your community knowing that they will find relief in case of real distress?

I do not think so; I think, as a matter of fact, that the tendency is to work, the inclination among the poor Jews is to work, and it is only a very small proportion which would think of being idle and thriftless in the hope of getting something from us, and especially with the knowledge that the little they would get would be such a miserable pittance as would barely keep them from starvation. We should only give to such cases a few bread tickets at a time, just to keep them absolutely from starvation; we should try to force them into the workhouse as a result. They would not go.

4997. I suppose I should not be going too far if I say that, as a rule, the Jews are specially industrious?

The Jewish poor, certainly, are very industrious indeed.

4998. And also, from your strong bond of connection as Jews, you have, I suppose, very special means of getting full information about all person connected with your community?

I think, practically, we know all the poor Jews in the metropolis. I may say, that when a new case comes up it is generally one which is one of decay, which only comes to our knowledge because it has come down. We keep registers, as you see from our statistical tables, very full indeed, and we know practically all who are in want.

4999. Is there anything more that you desire to add to your evidence?

There is one point as to which I do not know that it exactly comes within the sphere of your Lordships' inquiry, but which I should like to see carried out a little fuller; and that is some system by which desertion of children could be a little more checked. Now my Board is very diligent indeed in searching out the parents of deserted children, and we, in every year manage to re-unite, not dozens, but scores of families where children have been deserted by their parents. I think if some department existed in the parishes whereby the fathers or the mothers who desert their children could be sought out, not only necessarily whilst they are on these shores, but even when they go abroad, with a view of rejoining the families, a very much less amount of child desertion might probably take place; or when that desertion does take place the families being re-united in that way, a great deal might be saved in that way to the parishes themselves. I know over several years it has run to nearly 100 cases of desertion, when we have found out the parents, most of them in London, but we have followed them up frequently to the United States, when the father has gone away to the United States in the hope that we should do for the wife and children; we have done little or nothing for the wife and children except to re-unite them with the husband. We have had our agents abroad; we have impressed upon the man the necessity of taking back his children, and he has ultimately agreed to do so upon their being sent to him. And a case is now under the consideration of my Board where we have been searching for two years, and only the other day we have got a little bit of clue to the woman, and I believe we shall be able to get her to take her child. The child has been all the time in

the
the Whitechapel Workhouse and Infirmary; they have been very kind to us in permitting us to keep it there. We could have removed that child by an election into the Orphan Asylum, or under the provisions of the Pauper Removal Act; but we preferred letting it remain for two years, in order that we might have a chance of finding out the mother and returning the child to her. If any department existed in each parish for thus seeking out the parents of deserted children, not only in this country but elsewhere, I think a very beneficial work would be done.

5000. Have you any of the class of casual poor, any persons who apply to you for a night's lodging belonging to what is called the vagrant class?
There are plenty of people who would come and ask for it; but our answer to them would be, "Go to the casual ward;" there is nothing in a casual ward to which a Jew could not go.

5001. You do not take charge of that class?
We do not house them.

5002. Earl of Onslow.] Is there not in existence a shelter in Leman-street which receives cases such as those the Chairman has just been describing?
There is a shelter in Leman-street; but I believe their avowed purpose is to receive new comers more than those who only want a night's shelter. They probably would fill their place with them if they had room.

5003. But if a poor Jew wanted a shelter for the night, and had been some time in England, and applied there, would he not be received?
He might be; I do not know their laws.

5004. Does it not take the place of the casual wards, for all practical purposes, for the Gentiles?
I certainly do not think it would, because it is on so small a scale.

5005. What proportion of cases that have been dealt with by the Jewish Board of Guardians return to be dealt with again?
I will give you one year, for example, if you will permit me. Taking the year 1887, there was a total of 3,313 cases relieved; that is, exclusive of the loan and industrial departments. Of these, 1,205 were new cases; 1,840 were cases which were relieved in the previous year; and only 268 from prior years.

5006. Is that a fair sample of preceding years?
Yes; it is almost identical in proportion. In 1886, of those more than two years' old, or one year and 364 days, there were only 334 cases out of 4,139; showing what I wished just now to dwell upon, that we strive to make our relief of a measure to bring about permanent good.

5007. Do you know now, at all, what number of Jews in London are relieved at the expense of the rates?
I have no means of telling that; but I know it is very small; excepting medical relief, very little. Mr. Vallance, who was before you the other day, was saying to me one day when I saw him, that it was something ridiculously small the long time it was since he had had many cases, excepting in the infirmary. It was a matter of no account whatever.

5008. You said that persons of bad character would not be relieved by your Board of Guardians, but would have to rely upon friends. Supposing they had no friends, would there be any alternative but the workhouse?
None whatever.

5009. Then those cases would have to come upon the Gentile rates?
Yes.

5010. And have you any system of connection between your Board of Guardians and the Board of Guardians of the parish?
We are on the most absolutely friendly terms, and in constant intercourse, over the cases which are removed from the workhouse to the certified schools, and over the medical relief; but we do not in any way clash.

(70.)
5011. But would every case of a Jew applying to the board of guardians of the parish be referred in the first instance to you, or would the guardians deal with it themselves?

They would not refer it to us; but I do not think any go there before they come to us.

5012. Your board of guardians is so well known throughout the metropolis that every Jew would apply to you before he applied to the parish board.

Certainly, and I think if our Board did not exist they would all go to the parish.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. GEORGE HOLLAND, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5013. Earl of Aberdeen.] You have for a long time had large experience among the poor of London; would you kindly state to the Committee the number of years, and the general circumstances of your experience?

I have had about 40 years' experience, 35 years in the eastern part of London, Whitechapel.

5014. And have you during that period, or the greater part of that period, been superintendent of ragged schools and institutions connected therewith?

Ragged schools and a mission. We have about 40 different operations in connection with our mission.

5015. Among the operations, would you kindly describe those which have specially in view the promotion of thrift and providence among the poor?

We have, and have for many years had, what we call a Labour Loan Society. I would just refer to the years 1886 and 1887. We have 500 members in connection with that society, and each member pays 6d. a week and can borrow money. Those being shareholders have to be the security for the money so borrowed. In the year 1886 we took 500 l. in sixpences; in the year 1887 we took 600 l. in sixpences. We turned that money over in loans to the members (they finding their own capital, borrowing their own money) about three times, about 1,800 l. altogether in the year.

5016. They would come to apply for whatever portions of their money they might require at any time?

Their own money.

5017. Is there any interest?

Yes, 5 per cent. They pay their own secretary and their own stewards.

5018. Were the years you mentioned years when there was a great deal of exceptional distress, or what was reputed to be exceptional distress?

Yes, they were years of exceptional distress; 1886 and 1887.

5019. Is that system in operation at the present time?

Not at present, for this one reason, that we require some responsible person to manage it.

5020. But it was successful so long as you had it going?

Yes, it was successful so long as we had it going. It is only in abeyance for the time, till we have some responsible person to take it up. I would suggest that work of that kind might be taken up by boards of guardians, and form one part of a plan of out-door relief.

5021. You think that some system might be brought to bear in connection with the administration of the Poor Law?

I do.

5022. Will you indicate in what way you think it might be done?

For instance, supposing that a man is out of employment, he can immediately apply for the money he has in the society, or any portion of it; he can borrow a portion
a portion of it; he can purchase tools and get to work. Should 10 co-terr-
mongers be out of employment, they can apply at once for, say, 1 l. each: they
would then go with their money to Billing-gate or the Fruit Market, and where-
ever there was a glut of fish or of fruit they could purchase it, and then divide it amongst themselves, and then they would go and sell it in the streets. If
they had not a fund of that kind they would very likely be applying to the parish for relief.

5023. Do you think that that would do away with the necessity or the demand
for out-door relief to a great extent?
I do not know any of those connected with this loan society who have had
any out-door relief. I should also say that we have a benefit society.

5024. Will you describe it?
It is not a large one, but just for the neighbourhood; and we have also other
clubs for women, mothers; for clothing and coals and boots last year we received
from women, 80 l.; from one mothers' meeting we collected that money in
twopences and threepences.

5025. Would you say that the want of such practices in the way of thrift
and providence is one of the chief causes of the distress which one so often
hears of?
I do. But then I would add drink. But I must be fair, and say that poverty
leads to drunkenness as well as drunkenness leading to poverty.

5026. For instance, would you say that the insufficiency of edible food tends
to drink?
Yes. The homes of the people are such that very often they are not in a
position even to boil a kettle of water; and when that is the case, they will go
into a public-house directly and obtain what they call liquid bread.

5027. Now, do you consider that the Official Returns as to the numbers of
paupers in the various districts of London are a reliable guide as to the extent
of poverty?
I do not think so.

5028. Will you give some reasons for that opinion?
A very great many persons would not apply to the union at all; they would
not think of doing so, for they would not enter the house, and if they applied
for relief they would simply be told to come in. There is a very strong pre-
judice against doing that.

5029. You would regard with satisfaction, no doubt, a feeling of self-respect
which would make people reluctant to come upon the rates?
Yes.

5030. But do we understand that you think that the special cause of the
strong aversion to the workhouse which exists is in many cases the knowledge
of the class of people there with which respectable persons would have to
associate?
I have met with respectable persons who have been old ratepayers, possibly
they had paid rates for 10, 15, 20, and in one case I know, 26 years, and when
applying for relief, they have shown their receipts for their taxes, but they had
nothing else but in-door relief offered to them.

5031. Do you think anything could be done by way of classification of the
different classes of applicants for relief?
That is done, I think, in some parishes; notably, I think, in Marylebone, if I
remember rightly.

5032. Then that would take away part of the difficulty?
Yes. The society with which they mix is a very great objection in the minds
of very many to their entering the house; and then the breaking up of the
family; that is another objection.

(70.)
5033. You would be strongly opposed, would you not, to anything like indiscriminate out-door relief?
   Yes. I would have such relief thoroughly well fenced round by strict rules.

5034. How many children have passed through the George-yard Ragged Schools, of which you are superintendent?
   Forty-five thousand in 33 years. That includes all the sections of work conducted for children; we have various sections of work.

5035. Have you had much occasion among these children to deal with the insufficiency of food?
   Yes, frequently. I may say almost daily in winter. It is something very painful indeed. We are compelled to feed our children three or four times a week, and give them nourishing food, or they would drift into serious illness, and the health of society at large would be endangered. I would first state, with your Lordships' permission, that in the year 1886 I thought I would charge for the food, and I said I would give a basin of soup and a slice of bread for a 1/4d. There were 280 children in the day-school at the time. We announced it in the morning, and out of the 280 children 50 brought their halfpence in the afternoon. It went on like that for a week or two, and then the whole 280 paid; but there came a day when only seven had a 1/4d each, and we were obliged to feed indiscriminately.

5036. You are aware that it is often said that any kind of feeding or distribution of benefits in connection with such an institution as yours is objectionable and demoralising; have you anything further to say with regard to that objection?
   I consider it is anything but that; in fact (I do not know whether I ought to mention a circumstance like that I am about to mention now), so strongly did it impress my mind a few years back, that I for two whole months went without really nourishing food, almost living on dry bread and tea, that I might feed my children, because I could not get meals to feed them at that time. This I am convinced of, that if the children were not fed they would perish.

5037. Is the insufficiency of food a cause also of sickness and infectious disease?
   Yes. Going back to the year 1862, when I had not the means I have now for feeding my children, I remember I had no less than 70 down with fever.

5038. Have you met with any of the bad results which certainly might be expected where anything of this kind is done without such precautions as you appear to have taken?
   No. All our cases are under investigation; we know every case; not only are the children who are thus fed known to us, but they are known also to the School Board visitors, who know the condition of the people.

5039. But you would admit that without such careful precautions anything like promiscuous feeding would be deleterious?
   I do think so; I think we should be most careful.

5040. And do you think that the prejudice which exists against this kind of charity (a very proper prejudice in most cases) is due to the fact that it has so often been carried on without proper discretion?
   It may have been carried on recklessly by some. It would only help cases known to me and known to my helpers.

5041. Chairman.] You said that you did not think that the returns of pauperism in the Metropolis were a guide to the extent of poverty; but should you go so far as to say that the comparison of returns of pauperism for a series of years may not be taken as an indication of the increase or decrease of poverty in London?
   I hardly think so, for this reason: that those who make up these returns can only deal with the cases which come before them, and that is all they can do; and there are thousands who never make any application.

5042. But
5042. But comparing year with year, is there not reason to suppose that the same average of persons come forward in one year as in another, and, therefore, in that way it must be, must it not, an indication of the amount of poverty?
I think there are fewer people now who apply for relief to the parish than in former years.

5043. I think you said that you commenced your work among the poor about 1861?
Before that; in 1854.

5044. When I tell you that the return of the number of paupers in 1857, as compared with the number of paupers in 1888, shows that in 1857 there were 46'8 paupers to every thousand inhabitants, and that in 1888 there were 25'9 to every thousand, would you not be disposed to admit that the difference between 46 and 25 in the number of paupers per thousand shows a very considerable decrease in poverty?
Yes: but in the year 1857 out-door relief was then given, and that has to a great extent been discontinued, and the result is this, that there are fewer applicants now.

5045. Or I might take the year 1871, which would be a very good year to take, that being about the time when the new system was introduced, and then I find there were 50'4 as compared with last year, 25'9; so that pauperism has diminished by nearly one-half since 1871?
That is according to the figures as we get them from the Poor Law authorities.

5046. That indicates a diminution of pauperism of one-half. Should you consider that the whole of that diminution is due to the stricter administration of the Poor Law?
The diminution of applicants, because I must deny that there is less poverty or less distress.

5047. I asked you whether you thought that the diminution of nearly one half was entirely to be accounted for by the stricter administration of the Poor Law?
I should think it would be so.

5048. Therefore we may presume that 25 per cent. were receiving relief formerly who do not require it now?
What I would say is this: that in the year 1871 there would be a larger number applying for relief than there would be in the year 1881 or 1888.

5049. And that would be in your opinion, as I understand, because, there being a stricter administration and less out-door relief given, fewer applicants would apply?
Yes, that would be so.

5050. Then I think I am right in inferring that the diminution of pauperism (I do not say poverty) is directly due, in your opinion, to the stricter administration of the law?
Then you see we must make a difference between pauperism and the extreme poverty with which I come in contact.

5051. We will confine it if you please, in the first instance, to pauperism?
I do not know so much about the workhouse system; I can only speak of the people with whom I come in contact with.

5052. Two inferences may be drawn from these figures. One inference would be that poverty has diminished on the whole in London during these years, and that therefore a portion of the decrease may be ascribable to a decrease of poverty. Another deduction might be, which I rather suppose to be yours, that the decrease is not due to a decrease of poverty, but is due to a stricter administration of the law?
I think that.

(70.)
5053. I understand you to say that you think it is due entirely to a stricter administration of the law?

Persons now cannot obtain out-door relief as they formerly did.

5054. Then the necessary conclusion must be that in some way or other a large number of persons exist without relief from the rates, who formerly did receive relief from the rates?

I am inclined to think that there is a great deal more done in the way of charity than there was.

5055. It is perhaps almost certain that the result has been that there has been more charitable assistance than there was before?

I think so.

5056. Do you not regard that as a very desirable result; that instead of the poor receiving relief from the rates they should receive relief from charity?

In one sense I do; but supposing I tell you that nearly every morning I see poor people from half-past eight till ten, and that out of 100 cases I am unable to relieve more than five or six.

5057. But still it is generally thought (I do not know whether you share that opinion) that relief from the rates has a demoralising tendency, and it has been the great object of those who superintend the administration of the Poor Law, to diminish the number of paupers as much as possible, and discourage the population from resorting to that means of relief. Do I understand you to say that you regret that result of a better administration?

I consider that every person if in a state of poverty should have a perfect right to come upon the law for help, and I think that the law should be administered in such a manner so that persons who have passed through life respectably, and have reared families, and are in poverty, should not be told to enter the workhouse, as many guardians will offer. I consider that they should have out-door relief given to them.

5058. Your view is that every person who is respectable and finds himself without the means of subsistence, should have out-door relief given to him?

I think so.

5059. And you do not fear that the result of that would be to discourage thrift and to induce the population to rely largely upon the rates rather than upon their own exertions?

I think it would have no such effect, for this reason: that persons would rather do anything than go to the workhouse; many people look upon the workhouse as worse than a prison, and would rather go to prison.

5060. Did you ever read anything as to the state of this country before the new Poor Law?

I have in days gone by.

5061. Do you think it desirable to return to that state of things?

No.

5062. Would not the system which you advocate inevitably lead to the same consequence as the system which existed before the new Poor Law?

No, I would improve the system.

5063. The system before was one of out-door relief; and the system which you propose is one of out-door relief; what reason have we to suppose that the same ruinous and disastrous results would not follow?

What I would do is this: I would take money from the poor people.

5064. You would be in favour of a system of insurance?

Not exactly.

5065. Would you kindly explain the system which you would suggest.

I would take money from the poor, and take it generally. For instance, I would have a system of this kind: Here is a father, with a family, and in it a little babe 12 months old; so much would have to be paid for that child, so much for the next, and so much for the next, and so much for the father and
so much for the mother; and the Poor Law should be well fenced round with rules and regulations; there should be nothing like coming improperly upon that fund. And then I think the rates would be decreased; and a great deal of money could be obtained from the poor by such a system as that.

5066. But that would be in fact a universal benefit society?
Yes, almost.

5067. And would you make it compulsory on every man?
Indeed I would make it compulsory right through on every person.

5068. That, of course, in many respects, would not be open to the objection I was urging against the system of out-door relief?
No; and then, as for lazy people and drunkards, those who would not work, I would make them the scavengers of the day. We have plenty of courts and alleys in London requiring a daily cleansing, and it would be known that these persons were those who would not work, I would not pay them any money; it should be handed over to their wives and children.

5069. I will not go into that question of what I term an insurance fund or a general benefit society in the way of which, I daresay, you know there are very serious difficulties; but assuming that we are obliged to go on in our own present system, that we have not got this general benefit society, what changes would you suggest, if any, in the present system of administration?
I would only suggest, with respect to children, that I would board them out. Instead of having large schools where 1,200 or 1,400 children were brought together, I would have all those children boarded out and placed under a father and a mother; say two or three in a family; and I would make those persons the parents of these children.

5070. I think it is very generally held that the system of boarding out, subject to careful checks, is a very desirable one; but it appears to be applicable only to the cases of orphans and deserted children, because in the case of the children of other parents they may cease to receive relief, and the children then follow their parents; they are no longer under the control of the workhouse authorities. How would you deal with that large number of children who are not either deserted or orphans?
I would make the law now applying to reformatories and industrial schools applicable to these children, so that the parents could not take them away from the places where they are boarded out.

5071. Probably you are referring to what has been brought before us by other witnesses, and your meaning is that you would desire to have power to take away children from vicious parents?
Not in every case, because sometimes it is the father who is vicious, and sometimes it is the mother who is vicious.

5072. You appear to wish to extend it beyond vicious parents; but supposing a respectable man is receiving relief temporarily, perhaps for a month or two, how would you deal with his children?
I would not touch them; he should take care of his own children.

5073. Supposing that man comes into the workhouse for a month?
Then there must be a place to keep the children meanwhile.

5074. But those children could not be boarded out, I am afraid?
No; but they could be kept in a place in the workhouse especially for them. For my own part, I am opposed to workhouses entirely.

5075. These children would have to be kept in some school or some place or other whilst the father was provided for?
They are now so kept.

5076. I do not know if you quite apprehend my question. You say you would desire all the children to be boarded out; but it appears to most people that there is an insuperable difficulty in the fact that you cannot board out children unless they are to be permanently, or for some considerable time, under the (70.) control
control of the guardians; and I want to know what you would do with the children of parents who are receiving relief for a comparatively short time, four or five months it may be, or a year it may be.

Under the present system, I would have a kind of shelter for the time being to put these children in.

5077. That is what is now done?
I do not find fault with that.

5078. But under the system that you prefer, would you explain how it would be possible to board out all the children; I do not see how it could be done?
All the children who would be fit to be boarded out should be so placed out; there are some not fit.

5079. How can you board out the children of persons temporarily in receipt of relief?
You could not board them out.

5080. Would there not be a large number of those?
There would be a large number.

5081. Then a large number must be otherwise provided for?
Only temporarily, because they would return to their parents.

5082. That is the present system, is it not, of providing for them in district schools?
Yes, that would be the present system.

5083. Very likely you would agree with those who bring forward strong arguments to show that cottage homes, where there are not more than 25 or 30 children, are preferable?
Yes, I should think so.

5084. So as to avoid the evils incidental to a large number of children being brought together?
I should think a cottage, where only three or four children were, would be better.

5085. That is in the nature of boarding out?
Yes.

5086. But there is a large number that cannot be so boarded out?
That is so.

5087. You told us very properly that you would fence round your out-door relief by precautions; could you tell me what precautions you would take which are not taken now?
I could not well tell you that; I should leave that to the relieving officers and others.

5088. You have not in your mind any special precautions?
No.

5089. With regard to the children whom you feed, you mentioned that there were precautions taken?
Yes.

5090. Would you explain what they are?
Every case is under investigation; we know every father and mother of all the children in connection with our school. We know their condition, and we should not give any help to these children if there was any food at home.

5091. Therefore, by careful inquiry you are able to avoid cases of imposture; cases where, in point of fact, there exist the means to provide that which you otherwise provide?
Yes.

5092. But are there not cases of this kind where the parents really have the means, but they neglect their children?
Not in our case. Supposing there was a drunken father and mother, it would be very hard to let their children starve. What we should do in a case of that kind, if we found the father and mother in a state of drunkenness is this: we should turn parents for the time, and take the children into our shelter.

5093. Have you had cases of parents, perhaps not drunken, but yet worthless, who neglected to feed their children properly?
Yes.

5094. How do you deal with those cases?
We should put cases of that kind at once into the hands of the authorities; we should not hesitate to do that.

5095. Are you connected specially with any other charities besides those for teaching children which come in contact with the Poor Law?
We have a large work amongst grown-up people.

5096. In what way?
In connection with our mission. And I would speak now of a class, sometimes called the dangerous class, the inhabitants of the lodging-houses; they are casual labourers. Sometimes you will find them going into the house, and sometimes outside the house; but really, taking the whole mass of them, they are hard-working men. I have known them sometimes to start at five o'clock of a morning to seek employment, and walk a distance of fourteen miles, and return without finding work.

5097. Your experience is not that which so many witnesses say that theirs is; that class of casuals consists largely of professional beggars and tramps?
The professional beggar is well off; he can do far better than people imagine. The professional beggar never applies for parish relief; he will visit the west-end of London and in the south-western districts, and carry home at night the bag of food he has gathered, and sell it. He is worth a great deal of money sometimes.

5098. But you do not think that in the large number of cases which unfortunately come into the casual wards in London, it is true, as we are told, that they are mostly professional tramps?
Very few of the professional tramps, I think, enter the casual ward.

5099. And would you be astonished to hear that out of a very large number of cases investigated, something over 2,000, some five or six only were found to be deserving cases?
I can understand that. You may find a few men who are tramping from place to place who will go into the casual ward.

5100. What class do you imagine that these men belong to who frequent the casual ward?
They are men who really have no homes; but they go from casual ward to casual ward.

5101-2. What class of men are they; are they men who would work if they could get work?
Some; I am afraid very few.

5103. Have you anything to do with those men?
Very few indeed of them; it is no use their calling. I have experience with such men, I can read them down at once.

5104. What sort of men would come to you whom you would relieve?
They would be dock labourers and waterside labourers, as a rule. We do not profess to give relief, but we are compelled to do it; ours is a Christian mission, carrying on a spiritual work; but we find we are compelled to give relief.

5105. Have you any arrangement for giving these men temporary assistance, so as to enable them to get work when they are deserving people?

(70.)
Sometimes we lend them money, and if we have a very deserving case indeed, we would allow that person 5s. a week, perhaps for one month.

5106. Do you work at all in connection with the Poor Law authorities?
    Very well indeed.

5107. Do they ever refer cases to you?
    They do refer cases to me, and I must speak well of our own parish; the relieving officers sometimes send cases to me, and if I send cases to them they help me.

5108. You probably would agree with many of the witnesses we have had, that some system of co-operation between the Poor Law authorities and charitable organisations is very desirable?
    It is.

5109. So that the more deserving cases may be dealt with by charity?
    I may say that in connection with my mission we have two nurseries for children, and the relieving officer will call and say, "I have a poor mother, and I can find her employment if you will take the baby into your nursery." That often happens. Then we charge for that baby 3d. a day.

5110. One of the plans pursued in London appears to be that widows with more children than they can support are offered the alternative of giving over two of their children to the authorities to be sent to schools or boarded-out; do you approve of that?
    I do not care for their going to schools; I will tell you why I do not like workhouse schools. I notice a very large number of the children who come out of these schools, principally the girls, appear just like a Deer let out of a cart before the hunt, looking about vacantly in every direction; they appear to know nothing at all. The whole system of training is wrong. If I might make a suggestion, the girls should be thoroughly trained for service. I would have not only in connection with each workhouse but, in order to prevent poverty, I would have in connection with a group of Board schools, a large building with, say 12 rooms. I would have nine of these furnished properly, just as a gentleman's house should be furnished, and the girls should be compelled, outside as well as in, to be trained in service just the same as they are now compelled to pass their fifth, sixth, and seventh standards. I would have compulsory teaching in that way, and my impression is that we should lose a great deal of our poverty, and a great deal of our pauperism, and have better wives and better mothers. And then I would have three rooms put on one side, where the girls should be trained to conduct a workman's home; shown how to make the home comfortable. You may ask where the teachers are to come from. There are plenty; many good old servants, now widows, would be glad to take up such work. The girls from our workhouses are turned adrift, and they know nothing. I have 350 elder girls and young women in connection with my work, their ages varying from 15 to 22; therefore I know a little what they have to go through.

5111. Earl of Strafurd.] Your remark about the deficiency of training does not apply so much to the boys, I suppose, as to the girls, because the boys are apprenticed out?
    Not so much to the boys.

5112. They are generally apprenticed out?
    Yes; but I think even the system pursued amongst the boys might be improved.

5113. Are the children you provide for able now to pay anything at all?
    No; many of them have been sent to us by the magistrates.

5114. At one time they were able to pay a halfpenny a day, you told us?
    That was for their food.
5115. Are any of them doing that at present?
No; at the present time we are not feeding them. We only do so at the worst season of the year, but no hungry children need go without bread; they can always apply for it. We teach our children to help themselves. Last year through my little cobbler's class I managed to have cobbled up 500 pairs of worn shoes.

5116. Who did that work.
The children themselves; we engaged a cobbler to teach them; the old shoes were given to us.

5117. Did they do anything else?
Carpentering, turning, printing.

5118. And did they show intelligence in their work?
I have a very beautiful platform, fretwork, and all cut out, made by the children.

5119. How many children have you at the present moment?
Taking the whole work, over a thousand.

5120. Is it within the Whitechapel Union?
Yes.

5121. What is it called?
The George Yard Ragged School Mission. And our work is a far-reaching work; it goes into every court and alley almost in that part of London.

5122. Earl of Hopetoun.] I take it that you are in favour of parents paying a small sum as a sort of insurance for each child; how would you propose to get that, when the parents have not got anything to give?
We must begin with those that have it.

5123. In cases where the parents marry very young, and probably have not any home to go to after they are married, there would be some difficulty in getting the insurance paid, would there not?
I think they would find the money for that; they would try to.

5124. Chairman.] Would it not have to be done really, if it were ever attempted, principally by making it the duty of an employer to deduct the amount from the wages he paid.
I think so; it could be done in that way.

5125. That, I believe, is the suggestion that has been made for carrying it out?
I would carry it out still further, and go into the question of burials, and relieve the parish of the funerals.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday next, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Luna, 2° Julii, 1888.
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Mr. WILLIAM MITCHELL ACWORTH, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5126. Chairman.] I think you are Guardian of Wandsworth Union?
That is so.

5127. How long have you been a guardian?
This is my third year of office.

5128. I observe that in the Wandsworth and Clapham Union the total pauperism is considerably below the average of London. The last return, which gives the mean number per 1,000 of population on the 1st July 1887, and the 1st January 1888, shows 16·2 for Wandsworth and Clapham, as compared with 24·2 for the whole of London; and 7·4 per 1,000 of population of in-door paupers as compared with 13·3 for the whole of London; and 8·8 per 1,000 of out-door paupers as compared with 10·9. It seems therefore, that whilst your whole number is below the average, your out-door relief is perhaps somewhat high in comparison with your in-door relief; can you tell us whether the administration in your union is strict as regards the giving of out-door relief, or the contrary?

I should describe it personally as very lax, but there is no doubt it is getting laxer. I have brought up papers just to give that point. I will take the corresponding week for three years. For the week ending 23rd June 1885 the out-door pauperism was 1,470; in 1886 it was 1,518; in 1887 it was 1,544; in 1888 it was 1,755. I should think that was a fair specimen; the last is the week ending the 13th June; it is practically about the same week.

5129. That is on a population in 1881 of 210,434?
It is much larger than that now; it is believed to be nearer 300,000; it is probably the part of London that is increasing the fastest.

5130. Then some correction, perhaps, must be made for the increase of population?
A very considerable correction.

5131. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Do you take in Peckham in your district?
No. Roughly speaking, we take a segment of a circle; if you take Vauxhall Bridge as the base, and run along the river to Putney, and then draw your circle round to the Crystal Palace and then come straight back, that is about our district.

(70.)
5132. Chairman.] Could you tell us the practice with regard to different classes of paupers. For example, taking sick able-bodied men who are heads of families; is it the practice of your board to give them out-door relief?

It is difficult to answer that, it is so much a doctor's question; I think it would really almost depend more on the doctors than on the guardians. I think I might say at this moment that it is very rare that the house is absolutely forced on anybody.

5133. Then even in the case of able-bodied men who are not ill but who apply for relief, I understand that you do not offer them, as a rule, the alternative of the workhouse?

Well, of course, our stoneyard is only open, say four months at the most.

5134. I will come to the labour yard presently. I will add to my question, when your labour yard is not open?

Then we have no alternative; then we have no legal power to give out-relief to able bodied men without a task of work, and the stoneyard is the only form in which we have a chance of giving a task.

5135. But you might have a task of work within your workhouse?

I believe it is not permitted.

5136. Under the orders under which you administer relief, that would not be permitted?

I believe not; I could not say to my own knowledge.

5137. Then before I come to the question of the labour yard, how do you deal with widows with children; do you require them to support a certain number if they are able to work, and how do you deal with the rest of the children?

A short time back we used to make a very strong effort, I would not say that we used to insist, but we used to try very hard to force the woman to let her children come to the schools, and we expected her to keep one child herself; but now to a very considerable extent they are allowed out-door relief. There is less pressure put upon them to send the children away than used to be; I think I will put it in that way.

5138. What is the reason why there is less pressure now; is that from a change in the board at recent elections, or from what cause?

Partly, I think, a change in the personnel, and partly the pressure of outside opinion.

5139. Is there a strong pressure of outside opinion for out-door relief?

I think there is no doubt the common opinion is in favour of it; but I do not think it is more so in our union than elsewhere.

5140. But if it is not more in your union than elsewhere, what is the reason why your guardians are more amenable to pressure than other guardians?

I do not know, I am sure; I do not know how to answer that question.

5141. What I wish to ascertain is whether your guardians are acting upon the opinion that out-door relief is for some reasons preferable to in-door relief?

I do not think I could say how much is actually their own reasoned opinion, and how much is the result of a feeling that their constituents wish it.

5142. Have they any opinion on this subject of their own?

I think some of us have a very strong opinion one way, and some the other. There are certainly some of the guardians, I think, who would in all cases give out-relief, would like to see the workhouse abolished practically; and others, not many I think, who would like to see out-door relief abolished.

5143. You have a labour yard?

We have had one for the last two years.

5144. Were
5:144. Were there many employed in that labour yard during the last two winters?
   About 150 each winter. I think I have the figures, if your Lordships would
care to know them.

5:145. If you have them, you might give them?
   I think I could say that 150 would be very nearly accurate. Last year, the
highest number apparently was 141.

5:146. Do you approve of the labour yard?
   It has done an immense deal of harm, I think, in our union.

5:147. Are you of opinion that there are men who avail themselves of the
   labour yard, who, if they were offered the house, would not take relief in any
form?
   I think almost without exception they come under that description?

5:148. So that, in point of fact, your labour yard is a machine for creating
   paupers?
   Many of them have been paupers before they come to it. It is certainly a
machine for creating pauperism; I would not say that it made paupers of the
individual men who get into it, because they have frequently been paupers
before.

5:149. But still in so far as they are paupers who would not in all probability be
   in receipt of relief if there were no labour yard, you may say that the labour yard
creates paupers?
   Yes.

5:150. Previously had you any labour yard at any time within your own
   recollection?
   Not within my knowledge. I believe it was finally given up eight or 10
years ago.

5:151. Why was it re-established?
   There was great pressure put on the board from outside. Perhaps I might
begin before the last two winters. At the time of the Mansion House fund
in 1886, my board of guardians made an attempt to deal with the unemployed
who were not, it was understood, paupers, and who were not to be treated as
paupers; and they started a system by which they set them do some work that
the guardians had to get done, and paid wages for it. They obtained the con-
sent of the Local Government Board to do their own work for them-selves
instead of employing contract labour; and they put on about 250 men on those
terms; and I should like, if I might, to put in the report of the architect who
superintended that work as to the work that was done. (See Appendix.)

5:152. Can you tell us the general effect of the report; was it that the result
   was satisfactory or the contrary?
   It was reported that we had a net loss of 29 l., out of, I think, about 1,500 l.;
that was on the balance-sheet on each side, and there was a deficit of 29 l.

5:153. So that on the whole the result might have been pronounced tolerably
   satisfactory financially?
   It was pronounced to be that, but I do not think that was quite a fair
representation of the case. It has been represented since, on more than one
occasion, as a successful effort, that the balance of loss was so very small; but
I do not think it really came out at all as satisfactorily as it was supposed to.

5:154. Why do you think it did not?
   I do not think it was exactly treating the thing as a mercantile transaction;
for example, they were set to dig out foundations, and the foundations were not
wanted at the time, and were not actually built on; I think, nine months
afterwards, and they had then been very much damaged by wet, and they were
found not to be in the place entirely where they were wanted for a subsequent
building; that was one of the things. Another thing was that we sifted very
large quantities of sand; we charged no royalty; it was on our freehold; we
credited
credited ourselves at the full value that it would be to sell, but we have not hitherto sold it.

5155. Were the wages paid the market rate of wages?
No, 2 s. 6 d. a day.

5156. Was this considerably below what an ordinary labourer would have earned?
A little below; I think it worked out at $3\frac{3}{4}$ d. per hour; because they only did a very short day's work, only about seven hours or 7½ hours.

5157. And how much per hour would be the ordinary rate?
I should say on an average probably 5 d. for labourers' work in the depth of winter.

5158. The result therefore was, was it not, that you deprived the labourers in your district of a considerable amount of employment for the purpose of giving charity to these particular men?
I think not, because I think most of the work was done twice over; otherwise I think it would have been so.

5159. Will you explain that answer?
As I say, for example, with regard to this case of the foundations, I think practically there was as much work to do after the foundations had been there for nine months, as if they had never been undertaken.

5160. Was the work necessary to be undertaken in any case, or was it undertaken for the purpose of finding employment for these men?
The Local Government Board I presume, before they gave their consent, were satisfied that the work was necessary. I do not think they would have been satisfied on the same evidence if it had been July instead of March.

5161. Was the result of that experiment that a considerable number of men expected to be employed in the following winter?
The result was that we had deputations every week for some period requesting us to give them work at wages, and we then had to explain that we had not work at wages to offer them; we did not attempt to do any other work otherwise than by contract.

5162. Was that the cause of your opening a labour yard?
The guardians felt that they must do something to get rid of the pressure, and they did open a labour yard.

5163. So that on the whole, in your opinion this experiment was prejudicial?
It certainly led the people to understand, and they have not got the idea out of their heads yet, that it is in our power, and that we obviously ought to provide work for people who have not got it for themselves.

5164. Was there any discrimination as to the people who were employed, or were all taken on who pre-ened themselves?
They were sent by the relieving officers, and the relieving officers were told that they were to exercise discretion with the people they sent; but I have got statistics from them within the last few days, and I find that of those they sent, a very considerable number either had been paupers before or have been paupers since. Out of 24 under one relieving officer, 4 have had relief since; 17 out of 62 in another district have had relief since; 10 out of 58 in a third district have had relief since; in a fourth, where the relieving officer has two districts at the present moment, in the one district out of 21, 7 have had relief either before or since; and in his other district, out of 68, all but 25 have had relief either before or since. In the remaining district 19 out of the 60 men employed in 1886 have either had or applied for pauper relief since.

5165. Can you tell us to what class of labourers these men principally belonged?
The report states: "A large proportion of the men described themselves as labourers, but there were at least 34 workmen of various trades, viz.: four bricklayers, one pipe-fitter, six carpenters, one printer, two engine-drivers, two
bakers, one engine-fitter, one Sawyer, one plasterer, one groom, one hatter, six painters, two iron-workers, one mason, one plate-layer, one book-porter, one Slater, and one dustman.” The largest average for any week was 234.

5166. Would these men who are described as labourers be, many of them men who work as bricklayers’ labourers?

No doubt a considerable number. There has been a great deal of building in the neighbourhood for many years past.

5167. I suppose they earn good wages in the summer?

The last time I asked I was told about 5½ d. an hour; 6 d. an hour for bricklayers’ labourers.

5168. A week of how many hours?

Fifty-two and a-half hours, I think, is the trades union week for the trade.

5169. Therefore, these men if they had employment in the summer, might reasonably have made some provision for the winter out of their wages?

They were able to do what other men in other parishes, where there was no arrangement of the kind, would do.

5170. The result therefore of the work you gave would be to enable them to be employed at lower wages in the summer?

There is no doubt that that is the tendency in the long run, of course.

5171. In your own opinion, I understand, this labour yard might have been dispensed with, and all the applicants might have been dealt with by the offer of the house?

I think there is very little doubt that if we had simply offered the house a very small fraction of them would have come into it. Perhaps the best proof one could give of that would be this: that in the last two years we have closed the labour yard—this time, being professedly a pauper yard—quite abruptly about the first week in April. The first year there were somewhere over 50 men in it; this year there were about 70; in neither year did anybody go into the house in consequence. Last year one man went in a little while afterwards, being, the relieving officer told me, a man who drank, and who had been in the house several times before.

5172. Is it your opinion that it would be desirable largely to restrict outdoor relief, as has been done in some other unions in London?

If it could be carried out consistently I have no doubt about it.

5173. Do you think it would be possible to reduce the out-door relief, as has been done in Whitechapel and St. George’s in the East, to a minimum, without an organisation of charity which could deal with cases where it might appear to be hard that men should be forced into the workhouse?

I think the number who would do anything further than simply cease to receive 2 s. or 3 s. a week would be so very small that it certainly would only need to be a very rudimentary organisation.

5174. You do not think that there would be even then a very large demand upon charity for these men?

I think they would simply either earn 2 s. a week more or spend 2 s. a week less.

5175. Is there any special charity organisation in your union?

There are several district offices of the Charity Organisation Society.

5176. Do they work at all in conjunction with your board?

A very little.

5177. You have a casual ward, I presume?

We have.

5178. Are you satisfied with the working of that ward?

Does that mean with our ward in particular, or with the working of the system?

(70.)
5179. I should be glad to know your opinion both of your own ward, in particular and as to the system generally?

I believe that our own, which is quite a new one, having been opened only in the last two months, is as good as it could possibly be made. I do not think there is any fault to find with our ward as distinguished from the system on which it works.

5180. You have always had a casual ward, I suppose, but this is a newly built one?

We had one of the associated wards, and we have abolished it and put up a cellular one in its place.

5181. What is your opinion as to the system generally of casual wards?

I cannot see that it is needed, and it is quite inconceivable that it could do good to anybody.

5182. Should you agree with some of the witnesses who have appeared before this Committee, who recommend that the whole class of casual paupers should be dealt with in the same way as other paupers, that is to say, that there should be no pauper casual wards, but that all persons applying for relief should be, if not relieved out, admitted into the workhouse?

My only difficulty about that would be the position that the benevolent public would take up; whether they would not be still more likely to give coppers in the street, and whether in that way the evil would not be worse. It would certainly be an advantage from the point of view of the administration of the Poor Law and the benefit of the casuals themselves if it was allowed to work.

5183. In order to work effectively, would it not be necessary that the police should put in force the law against begging?

I think that that would be necessary; and also that the charitable refuges should be brought under some restraint. In an ordinary year one alone of the London refuges has certainly about half as many of the casual class as all the casual wards together.

5184. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Which is that, Holborn?

Banner-street, Clerkenwell, in the Holborn Union.

5185. Chairman.] Do you think that the effect of the refuges is to encourage mendicancy?

I have no doubt of it, if a refuge is worked without any personal control or personal contact with the individuals.

5186. And what you fear is that if the casual wards were abolished, instead of casual wards under the control of the Poor Law authorities, we should have what would be practically casual wards under the control of philanthropic, and not very wise persons?

I should have said under nobody's control rather.

5187. But if a refuge is well managed, as is the case, I believe, with some refuges, and careful inquiry is made as to the men, and those only are helped who seem likely to get back to honest work, you would, I feel sure, have no objection to such a refuge?

I certainly should not like it if a refuge, except on a very small scale, was open to anybody who came to it. It seems to me that you want an inquiry at the door before you admit them, except in exceptional cases.

5188. What would be desirable would be that these refuges should deal with men who can be helped, so that they may cease to get their livelihoods as vagrants, and may be put in the way of getting honest work?

Yes.

5189. For such persons the refuges would be highly beneficial, would they not?

Certainly.

5190. How
5190. How do you deal with the children of your union; are they sent to district schools or boarded out?

We board out I believe every case legally eligible, and of the children who are on our hands, as distinguished from those with their parents receiving out-relief, it is only about one-seventh that we are able to board out.

5191. At a distance from London?

Mostly in Bedfordshire or Sussex.

5192. Are you satisfied with the result?

I think there is no doubt that it is better for the class that can be sent to be so boarded out.

5193. And those who do not come within the class of orphan and deserted children can be boarded out and sent to a district school?

To Anerley.

5194. What number of children are there in that school?

I think we have on an average about 500.

5195. We have been told that there are some evils incidental to such large assemblages of children in these schools, that they necessarily become very mechanical in their ways through ignorance of the outside world; have you found that in your school?

I have not a right to speak with much authority about Anerley; I am not one of the managers there. I think that that is very much exaggerated. Of course I do think at the same time that there is a difficulty, and that it is a difficulty that might be very much got over if philanthropic people outside, instead of starting competitive schools on a small scale, would try to deal with the large number of children who are in the schools already. It is a great pity that they are not more visited.

5196. Have you an infirmary separate from your workhouse?

A very large one; nearly 700 beds.

5197. Do you find that since your infirmary has been put, as I suppose it has, on a better footing than formerly, in the same way as other London infirmaries, there is a greater tendency on the part of the poor to resort to it?

Our district is growing so fast that I think that would be a very difficult question to answer; it would need a longer experience than mine; and besides that the district is growing so fast, and the people are getting older, if I may so say. Battersea started probably 20 or 30 years ago with young people coming up to London going and settling there; these people are gradually getting older, and wanting medical help. The numbers coming to us are increasing very fast.

5198. Are many of the poor in medical clubs in your union?

I could not say at all how many.

5199. Are there such clubs?

Yes, there are several.

5200. Are many of them in benefit clubs, as far as you are able to judge?

The larger proportion of the inhabitants of Battersea are rather the superior working class, a very large proportion of artizans, and there is no doubt that a great many of them are; but I could not speak with any knowledge on that subject.

5201. Have you suffered in your workhouse from what are termed in-and-out paupers, paupers who come in for a very short time and go out again, and repeat the same proceedings very frequently?

I got a list of the names of one or two people of that kind not very long ago who had been in and out at intervals of a week or two. Among them there was a man and a woman, and the only occasions on which they had been away from the workhouse for more than a day, or two days at a time, was when they had been sent to prison; they generally came back either the same day or the next day.

(70.)
5202. Some of the witnesses are of opinion that a greater power of detention should be given to the guardians so that paupers of that class might be required to remain not less than a week in the workhouses; have you considered that point?

It seems to me hopeless to attempt it in the present state of public opinion. I have no doubt it ought to be done; but if we got the power, we could not use it practically, because public opinion would not back us up. The magistrates would not convict them if they broke doors in order to get out; the magistrates would then let them go.

5203. Do you think that public opinion in your union is more strongly in favour of lax administration than in average unions, because I should rather infer from your answer that it is?

I should be inclined to think that it is. Public opinion has only recently been directed to the subject, and it is a subject in which the obvious view to take is that the right thing is to give out-door relief. Here is a man who is poor; he wants money. Give it to him. That is the natural view to take to start with, and they have not attended to the subject long enough to see the after effects.

5204. Has there been any emigration promoted by the guardians from your union?

We have occasionally sent a child. I have no recollection of ever sending men.

5205. Apart from your labour yard, have you had any relief works either set on foot by the vestry or by charitable persons in your union?

We had that of which I spoke in 1886.

5206. In 1886 it was set on foot by the guardians?

It was set on foot by the guardians.

5207. In fact it was a portion of the relief given under the permission of the Local Government Board?

But it was not pauper relief; they did not pass through relieving officers books, and they were not counted paupers.

5208. Have you had any other relief works?

In 1887 the vestry took on a small number of people to sweep the roads and so on, but an inappreciable number compared with the population; and there was also on a small scale, a charitable undertaking of digging gravel from a pit.

5209. On a small scale, you say; on what scale?

I think they had 50 men three days a week, another 50 for the three other days, or about that number; and they gave them 2s. 6d. a day. Then we had this difficulty, that the same man who had been employed for 2s. 6d. on Monday applied to us to be admitted to the stoneyard we will say on Tuesday; and we thought that on our scale, 7s. 6d. a week would not be sufficient for the man, and we did not feel justified in refusing him, and accordingly we had the man doing charity work on three days a week, and coming to the stoneyard on the other three.

5210. And how much did he earn at the stoneyard?

I will put in a paper on that subject giving our Wandsworth figures and comparing them with other unions. Our maximum would be 12s. 6d. for a man and wife, and six children; 5s. 6d. a week for a single man; 11s. for a man with a wife and three children.

5211. Five shillings and sixpence a week you say for a single man; but when these men were earning 7s. 6d. a week in the gravel pit, did you give those men employment?

No, I do not think we should have given to a single man; but practically there were very few of them.

5212. It would only have been in the case where they were men who might have earned more than 7s. 6d. at your stoneyard?

I think that would have been so.
5213. Do you think that it would be wise to replace the present system of election of guardians annually by a triennial election, either electing them all every three years or electing one-third every year?

I think it might be an advantage; but it seems to me, I confess, that no system of electing men to administer relief would ever be satisfactory. I have often hoped that we might get a system something like that in existence at the School Board, where the committees who deal with the remission of fees are practically not elected at all, but are nominated, as persons interested in the subject, by the managers. They have no responsibility for policy, but only for carrying out certain rules that are laid down for them, and there is nothing to bias their judgment.

5214. I do not quite understand the system you propose; would it be that the board of guardians would be bound by certain bye-laws so strict as to leave them scarcely any discretion?

No: I would not have put it that the board of guardians would be bound; but the relief committees at the present moment, I think, in most unions are very much hurried over; I have no reason to suppose that my own board does the work faster than other boards, and I think we deal with a case in a minute; and it is quite obvious that you cannot go into the whole history of a family and decide what is best to be done for it in a minute; and I should like to see it handed over to committees who would be able to do the thing more quietly, and to take their own time over it, and who would not be directly representative, and who would have nothing to do with the financial control of the work.

5215. In what way would you constitute such committees?

Simply that the board of guardians should have power to co-opt, we will say. Supposing it were divided into wards of a parish; supposing each guardian for example, in my own union had a committee under him, it would deal with a population of about 10,000; and if a committee of five dealt with the cases of pauperism in that ward of a parish, it might be arranged so that there should be an elected guardian who presided, and they should all decide on the cases. Of course there would have to be an appeal to the board, if necessary.

5216. But in fact such committees would be appointed by indirect election, by the board, the board being elected by the ratepayers, and then the board handing over the business to some persons collectively?

It would be only this particular thing of administering relief; it would not be handing over policy in any sense; it would be dealing on principles laid down by the board, with individual cases, applying them to the individual cases.

5217. But is there any difficulty in committees of the guardians giving the necessary attention to the cases, if they are so disposed?

I think it is impossible to suppose that you will ever get voluntary workers who will give their whole time.

5218. Then is it your view that these nominated committees should be paid?

No, not in the least; but now my board perhaps on an individual morning breaks up into three committees and deals with 200 applications; that is more than three committees can possibly get through; and therefore instead of that I would have 20 committees.

5219. Upon what do the elections of guardians in your union generally turn, on politics or on parish matters?

It is very difficult to answer, because different parts of the union are so entirely different. I am a guardian for the parish of Streatham, where almost everybody lives in a house of not less than 30 l. or 40 l. a year, and where there are a large number of people living in large houses with 12 votes; and in my union, people are returned because we get a list of probably 30 or 40 of the most influential people in the parish, and we say "Will you vote for Messrs. A., B., C., and D.," and we send round a circular to that effect, and there is no notion what policy we pursue; nobody interferes as to that. The Ratepayers Association that arranges this is supposed to guarantee that the guardians are (70.)
fit and proper persons, and there is no question of policy. But I believe that there are parts of the union where it is different; in Battersea where there is a working-man population, I believe they take a much keener interest.

5220. Are you an elected guardian?
I am elected guardian.

5221. Have you ex officio guardians in your union?
There are about 20, I think.

5222. Do they attend?
I think I remember three magistrates whom I have seen there, but not more than once or twice any of them.

5223. What is the whole number of guardians in your board?
Twenty six elected.

5224. Earl Spencer.] The parish of Battersea has been divided, certainly for ecclesiastical purposes?
I presume they are only district parishes.

5225. The old parish of Battersea, St. Mary's; how are the Poor Law divisions arranged in that?
There are four wards.

5226. Each returning how many?
One of them returns two; two of them, I think, return three. I am afraid it would take me some time to think out exactly, and I know none of them return more than four.

5227. But how many elected guardians are there for the whole of the old parish of Battersea, which comes up to Clapham Common?
I think 12 or 11.

5228. With a population of about?
I suppose about 150,000.

5229. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Not so much as that?
We always say it is for the whole parish of Battersea. It was nothing like it in 1881, I am aware, but we always say it is now; it is growing very fast.

5230. Chairman.] Is it not obvious that the remedy for the evils which you complain of is that the number of guardians should be largely increased?
I should be very sorry to see that.

5231. Do you think that 26 guardians are a sufficient number to administer the Poor Law in a union containing over 200,000 inhabitants?
I think we are quite sufficient to do our work as a board; to do all the administration, and the management of the workhouse and the infirmary, and so forth.

5232. But surely the most important part of your work at the board, and that for which you really exist, is the administration of relief, and you have shown very clearly that you do not discharge that duty at all adequately; can it be supposed that a board of guardians does its duty which takes a minute over each case; and it may fairly be ascertained, I think, to the number of your board being so small that you cannot give the necessary time to the consideration of the cases; if the number of your board were increased, would not that meet a very considerable portion of the difficulty?
I do not think so; I do not think that would be an advantage. We might perfectly well, for example, divide ourselves into five committees of five each.

5233. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Do not you feel that you are too few in number, by the suggestion that has been made for co-optation?
I do not myself, because I want to see it not done by elected guardians.

5234. Chairman.] But supposing that your view was not adopted, and that
the work continues to be done, as now, by elected guardians, would it not be a
great advantage to you to have a larger board, so that you might form more
committees?

I think it would be a much less disadvantage if, instead of doing that, we
divided the 26 into eight committees, and three sat on each. I think ours is
one of the largest boards in London, except the City; that is my impression.
It certainly is larger than the neighbouring one of Lambeth, which is a larger
parish, and has a much larger number of paupers.

5235. Have you anything further to add?

I was going to say this, as to the class of people that come to the stoneyards
and to the casual wards. We have had for the last two years large building
works going on, and the foreman of the works, at our request, took on from
time to time about 60 or 70 men, and I got from him a list as to the number
of men who stopped and did any work, and I do not know whether I might
hand the paper in; it is, probably, the best way of giving evidence on that
subject (handing in the same, see Appendix). Those, of course, were the picked
men of those who came to us.

5236. Lord Balfour of Burley.] I think I am right, am I not, in saying that
when an able-bodied man presents himself to you and asks for relief, you can at
present under the law deal with him only in one of two ways: by offer of relief in
the house, or by an offer of relief in return for a test of work in the labour
yard?

That is so.

5237. A suggestion has been made to us that a third way might with advan-
tage be adopted; that, to avoid the breaking up of the home, which is often
regarded, and rightly so, as a great evil, the head of the family should be taken
into the house, allowed out on one or two specified days in the week to look for
work, but that the home should be kept up by relieving the wife and family in
it. Have you anything to say upon the policy which underlies that?

I should say the same about that as I say about the restriction of out-door
relief. It implies a board of guardians with a consistent policy under practi-
cally a certainty that they will be allowed to pursue it. I should be very sorry
to see it attempted in my own union, because I should expect to see it up-
set at the polls in the following year, and I think that would be a great
disadvantage.

5238. Your objection to it then is guided by the disadvantages of your own
union, rather than by any drawbacks to the policy itself?

I should, personally, be very glad to see it done.

5239. I understand your evidence to have been in this direction: that the
majority of your guardians are in favour of giving out-door relief to a consider-
able extent; do they give that out-door relief to such an amount in each case
as to be adequate for the support of the family?

I should have said the commonest amount would be about 2 s.

5240. What is the argument in favour of giving 2 s. to a man who presents
himself, and says he is destitute?

I do not think I ought to represent it; I am afraid I could not make a strong
case for it. It certainly is a very common thing that we have an application
in which this is put down: “Total income of the applicant, 2 s., weekly rent
3 s. 6 d.,” and we then give the applicant 2 s.

5241. But is it not obvious that the applicant must have some other source
of income?

Quite, I think; but we do not know of it.

5242. But do you not have a statement prepared by the relieving officer,
and put before your board, of the whole circumstances of the applicant?

Yes; and the relieving officer will tell you, and I have no doubt it is true,
that from all he can learn the total income of the applicant is 2 s. 6 d.; and we
simply
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simply act on the principle that it is impossible to believe that. I believe that is done in all cases where out-relief is given.

5243. And then in spite of that, you give an amount of 2 s., or 2 s. 6 d., or 3 s., a week?

An amount that is obviously inadequate.

5244. Has that policy been continued over a long series of years?

I have never heard of its being otherwise. My own experience, I may say, is not at all long.

5245. But the effect of that is that pauperism is increasing in your union?

It would, perhaps, be hardly fair to say that pauperism is increasing in consequence of my board's policy. I cannot say whether the percentage of pauperism to the population is increasing. The population is increasing, you see, so fast, and we have not the statistics to tell us.

5246. You mean that, owing to the shifting nature of your population, you cannot compare one period with another very easily?

Our union increased between the years 1850 to 1881 from 50,000 to 210,000; and it has certainly increased very much since then.

5247. I gather from you that you do not feel justified in stating what the arguments of the majority of your board are in favour of the system which you pursue?

The general argument would be that it is kind, and, of course, also the argument that it is cheaper for the board; that if you take a man into the house he costs more than 2 s. a week.

5248. But cannot you show that a very small proportion of those that take your 2 s. or 2 s. 6 d. would come into the house?

Of course you can show that; that is what I have said very often; but the answer made to me is, "Yes, but it is very hard on the people who stop out; they are that 2 s. worse; that 2 s. would just make the difference to them, between being able to get along and being very seriously pinched."

5249. That is shifting from the argument that it is cheaper:

Entirely.

5250. We had a witness some time ago who made a point of the want of uniformity of administration over the metropolis, and in illustration of that want of uniformity he pointed out that the scale of relief in labour yards was very different, and instanced the case of Rotherhithe, where 2 s. 4 d. a week was given, and Battersea, where 5 s. 6 d. was given, and in further examination it came out that Mr. Peek (who was the witness to whom I refer) quoted these figures from a statement drawn up and published in the columns of "The Times" newspaper. I believe you have taken some trouble to get correct information on that point?

That is so.

5251. Could you give us some of the information which you procured?

I think our clerk sent round to the other boards, and got their particulars, and I abstracted it from that at the time, and from that I made this paper (producing a paper), which I put in; and then I also got some information privately.

5252. The point which I understood Mr. Peek to make was that the 2 s. 4 d. is fixed under the regulations to be given at Rotherhithe, and that, under the same regulations, 5 s. 6 d. was given at Battersea. Is that correct?

The fact is correct. I certainly consider that this is a metropolitan question; that what relief is given in the stoneyard at Battersea concerns the workmen at Rotherhithe, and therefore it is absurd that it should be left to the discretion of individual guardians. What is done in Birmingham does not affect the London workmen, but what is done in one union of London does very much affect all the other unions;
union; and, therefore, it is a thing that ought to be settled by a metropolitan board, and not a single parish.

5253. Did you satisfy yourself that the regulations under which a man would get 2 s. 4 d. at Rotherhithe would be the same as those under which you at Battersea would give him 5 s. 6 d.?

Yes, in each case; the scale is 2 s. 4 d. for single men at Rotherhithe, and 5 s. 6 d. for a single man at Battersea.

5254. A week?

Yes; there is no doubt of that. I got the scale all the way through: a man with one child, and all the way through to six. I compared a single man, a man with three children, and a man with six children, as you find on that paper.

5255 And you found that the difference as between the man at Rotherhithe and the man at Battersea, in the case of a single man, was as great as between 2 s. 4 d. at Rotherhithe and 5 s. 6 d. at Battersea?

That is so.

5256 But what is your suggestion for remedying that?

That it ought to be metropolitan; it ought either to be definitely handed over to a metropolitan Board, or else, either by pressure from the Local Government Board, or in some other way the boards of guardians should be got to agree on the subject.

5257. Is it your suggestion that it should be arranged by conference, or deputations to a central conference of the metropolitan guardians, or that a more stringent rule should be laid down by a central authority, to which they should be required to conform?

It is difficult to speak in the present position of London affairs. Speaking for myself, I should like to see, say, the casual wards and the stoneyards handed over, for example, to the Metropolitan Asylums Board, which already exists as a delegation from the guardians.

5258. Is there any other point upon which you would like to speak?

I should like to be allowed to say, in reference to stone-breaking, that this seems to me a very great hardship; that the stoneyard scale is out of all proportion to the out-relief scale. I have a recollection of one morning last December, when we first opened our stoneyard for the current winter. We had up several cases. We had two lads living in common lodging-houses who had no home whatever to keep together; we gave them 5 s. 6 d. to go into the stoneyard. Then we had up a man as to whom it was reported by the relieving officer that he practically earned nothing; his wife kept the home together.

5259. The man himself was of bad character, I suppose, and did not work?

Yes; I have no doubt that I am right in saying that he was of bad character; he certainly earned nothing. It may have been his misfortune, but his wife kept his home together; but being a man with a wife and six children, we sent him into the stoneyard, and he gets 12 s. 6 d. a week, so that he is a great deal better off in winter than he is in summer. Then we go on a little farther, and we come to a man of very good character. He had been a bus driver, and had belonged to a club from which through a very long lingering illness he was superannuated; instead of getting his 18 s. which I think the Hearts of Oak gives, he was only getting 4 s. superannuation allowance. He has a wife and four children, but we only allow him 5 s. a week because he has out-relief.

5260. Would any set of regulations which could be devised by a central authority enable a board of guardians which act in that way to act reasons by?

I do not think that that is quite fair to my board of guardians, because I think they are acting as every board would do that gave out-relief. It is impossible that a board should give 12 s. out-relief habitually. If they did that (70.)
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5261. You mean that if the public were brought face to face with their doing that, they would rise up in condemnation of it; but as they can do it secretly through the stoneyard, the evil policy is concealed from those who would check it?

No, I did not mean that; but the stoneyard is only open for a certain length of time in the year, and the task that is set there is deterrent to a very great extent, and therefore you are not liable to be swamped in the case of the stoneyard; but if you were to give 12 s. or any sum that would really be adequate in out-door relief cases, which go on all the year round, of which there would be an unlimited number, because there are always many men ill, the rates would go up to something portentous; everybody looks on the stoneyard as a distinct disgrace. A man is seen to go into it, and he feels it a disgrace; but it is no disgrace to send one of his children to the relieving officer to get 12 s.

5262. Chairman.] How many children had this man?

Four.

5263. Lord Balfour of Burley.] If the omnibus man had had the same number of children as the incompetent person, would he have received the same amount of relief?

I daresay he might have had a little more. Our nominal standard is 1 s. and a loaf a child after the first one or two; but he certainly would not have got more than, say, 8 s. I have hardly ever known more than 6 s. given in an out-relief case for any length of time.

5264. Earl Spencer.] I think you told us that the union is arranged in wards; I presume that the different wards vary a great deal in the character of the persons who live in them?

Battersea is divided into wards, not the other parishes.

5265. But in Battersea itself I suppose there must be a good deal of variety of circumstances in those who live in the different wards?

I believe No. 4 ward contains a considerable population of a better class; but practically you would not be very far wrong if you said that Battersea was working class throughout.

5266. But in the other parts of the union, Penge?

Penge is not in the union, but Streatham, Clapham, Putney, and the small parish of Tooting; they principally represent the better class of persons. Streatham is very much richer.

5267. Does that cause antagonism between the two, the representatives of the poorer and the richer class?

There is possibly a little tendency that way: I do not think it can be put stronger than that.

5268. You do not find that either of these two classes take up one side more particularly than the other?

Certainly there is a tendency among the guardians from Battersea, who represent the working classes, to take a more lax view.

5269. Have they been long on the board, these men who take a lax view at Battersea?

The men whom I am more particularly speaking of are newly elected, either this year or the previous year.

5270. And those who were previously elected, do they hold a different view?

We have lost more than one Battersea guardian who was distinctly in favour of restricting out-relief.

5271. After some experience on the board?

Yes.

5272. And
5272. And were they changed because they took that view?
I do not think I could answer that. No doubt that had something to do with it, but I have no right to speak on the point.

5273. Earl of Hopetown.] I suppose even in the poorer parts of your district, compared with the poor parts of the East-end, there is less pauperism?
The poorest part of the district ought to be Battersea. The part where there is most pauperism is Wandsworth, which is an old district.

5274. But taking the class of workmen that you have in your district, do they go elsewhere for work?
At Battersea there is a great deal of employment on railways, which is in the immediate neighbourhood, and a very great number of the inhabitants of course, go across the river to their work. You see Battersea is practically on the threshold of the West-end.

5275. You have not the class of dock labourers?
No, nothing of the kind; nothing of the casual labourer kind.

5276. You tell me that the feeling in the poorer districts is very much in favour of giving out-door relief; do not the people feel that a large distribution of out-door relief is apt in time to injure their own interests?
No, I am afraid there is no prospect of that being felt. The out relief is a fraction of the expense of the Poor Law. In our union our poor rate is something like 2 s. 2 d.; 1 d. produces 6,000 l., and 6,000 l. is about what we spend in out relief; so if we reduced it to nothing it would hardly benefit us; you would hardly notice it in the rates. A fever which sent up the Metropolitan Asylums Board claim might make more difference the one way than the whole of the out relief could make the other.

5277. Can you tell me with regard to the work done in the labour yards, was the actual work done by the men well or badly done, the actual bricklaying work?
You are speaking of what was done in 1886, which was not pauper work. There was very little bricklaying or anything of that kind, the great mass of it was wheeling stone and shifting sand, and digging and mending the roads, and things of that kind. It was only a small fraction of the whole that was supposed to be skilled labour; and they came to the conclusion that it would be better not to try that part of it again.

5278. Was that work paid for in money or kind?
In 1886 the non pauper work was entirely paid for in money; subsequently, of course, when it has been pauper work, we were legally bound to give half in kind.

5279. As a rule, did the men who received these payments take them home to their wives and families and really spend them on food, or did some of them spend them on drink?
I can give you hearsay evidence upon that point; I cannot give you more. I was told in the course of two or three days of a good many cases of men being met going into music halls with the money, and things of that kind; but it is of course only hearsay evidence.

5280. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Is not Shaftesbury-park within your union?
Yes.

5281. I suppose a good many persons who live in Battersea are employed north of the river, and come to sleep in Battersea?
That is so, certainly, a very large number.

5282. But of course sleeping there gives them a legal right to relief there?
Yes.

5283. With respect to the certainly large amount of out-door relief, do you think that the ratepayers are as much satisfied with it as the recipients of the relief are?
I think it is so small an amount that they do not notice it.

(70.)
5284. But is there nobody to inform public opinion of the great excess that there is of out-door relief in your union beyond that in other parts of the metropolis?

I do not think that it is so. The Chairman of this Committee read out just now that it was as 8 to 10.

5285. I was not referring so much to the aggregate amount of out-door relief, but what startled me was the fact you stated of something like, I think, 12 s. a-week, being occasionally given in out-door relief; am I correct in that?

No, that was in the stoneyard; we give up to 12 s. 6 d. in the stoneyard to a man with a wife and six children.

5286. Is it the case that there is a great deal of what is understood by active socialism in the union of which you are a guardian, in the way of meetings?

It is very obtrusive; I cannot say what their numbers are. We had deputations from the Social Democratic Federations once a week last year.

5287. Supposing that to be correct, do you suppose that would at all effect the election of guardians?

It certainly did.

5288. Earl of Strafford.] You were asked a question about the children that were boarded out, and I think you said that you approved of the system?

I approve of it very much.

5289. Have you a committee of ladies or gentlemen, or both, that look after and visit the children occasionally in the homes where they are boarded out; or how is the inspection conducted?

We have a committee of some half-dozen of us, of which I am chairman, that deals with the boarded out cases. We receive all the reports, and if we think there is anything wrong we send down and inquire. If we think the sleeping accommodation sounds inadequate, or anything of that kind, or when the child is not doing well at school, we send down and inquire; but we are not, I believe, legally entitled to send anyone to visit them, unless the guardians think fit to do it at their own expense.

5290. You have spoken of receiving reports; who supplies you with those reports?

The children are not allowed to be boarded out except in a parish where there is a committee, whose names are sent to the Local Government Board.

5291. And you receive all reports from that committee?

Yes, once a quarter.

5292. In Bedfordshire and Sussex you said your children were boarded out?

Yes.

5293. Have there been any bad cases of mismanagement in the way of deficiency of clothing, food, or lodging, that have been brought under your notice?

Certainly nothing bad; there have been things that might have been better.

5294. But nothing to cause you to send any special committee of your board to inquire?

Two or three of us went down one day last summer to Bedfordshire.

5295. To what part?

Close to Woburn.

5296. And were you satisfied with what you saw of the children?

There was one family where children were boarded out, with regard to whom I might say that I think they were not better dressed than the ordinary village children; I do not think I could put it lower than that. The others were markedly better.

5297. And
5297. And their physical appearance, was that satisfactory?
Yes, certainly.

5298. Do you think that this class of children ought to be better dressed than the children of their foster parents or of labourers in the villages where they are boarded out?
It is a very difficult question to answer. I am afraid they will have to be.

5299. Why?
Because you see you have got the terror of the newspapers and the public before your eyes if you do not. If a farm labourer has a child who is badly dressed, it is nobody's business; that is the farm labourer's look out; but here are these children handed over to a board of guardians with the funds of a union to draw upon; if they leave this child badly dressed, the newspapers will take it up and they will be spoken of as the people were in Saint Pancras the other day; and you cannot expect guardians to face that.

5300. Was that Saint Pancras case a case about clothing?
A case of neglect. The Saint Pancras guardians were accused of atrocious misconduct in connection with the condition in which some of the children were found.

5301. But supposing a child is healthy and seems to be well cared for, do you think that the question of clothes, that he or she is not better dressed than the children of the house where they are boarded out, would be a just cause of fear of criticism?
I would not be understood to say that they were better dressed than the other children in the same house; I do not think that was the case.

5302. I do not quite see what would be wrong. Supposing the child looked well and healthy and was not better dressed than the other children of the village, where would be the fear of any newspaper criticism against the guardians?
It would rather come in this way, that you are bound to give adequate provision for the child. You draw up a scale and say 10 s. a quarter is a fit and proper sum to supply clothing; and you allow 10 s. a quarter, and there are, we will say, three children succeeding one another, ten, eight, and six years of age, and they get among them 6 l. a year for clothing. I think there is no doubt that the ordinary agricultural labourer would not be able to spend 6 l. a year on his children's clothing. These three children would have 6 l. a year to be spent on clothing among them, with the advantage of passing over the clothes from A. to B. and from B. to C., and I think it is above the standard of an agricultural labourer.

5303. Chairman.] Do you see any reason why the treatment of these boarded-out children should be in any way, either as regards clothing, food, lodging, or any other circumstances, above the average of respectable agricultural labourers?
I do not see that it is avoidable. If you give less than 4 s. or 5 s. a week you will not get them taken into a respectable house; if you give 4 s. or 5 s. a week it is certainly more than the average labourer can afford for his children.

5304. A proportion of the 4 s. may be regarded reasonably as a remuneration for the care taken of the child, may it not?
Quite so, but still the house has to be taken into account; the housekeeping is conducted on a larger scale, and they will be better fed, and they will be better clothed.

5305. Fully admitting that 4 s. a week is more than an ordinary agricultural labourer in Bedfordshire could spend upon his child, must you not make a deduction from the amount for the remuneration which is reasonable for taking care of children who are not his own?
I think as a matter of fact they consider the children almost as much their own, and they like that they should have good Sunday frocks to send them out in.

(70.)
Would it not be likely to cause a great deal of discontent if a system generally prevailed by which pauper children were to be better fed, clothed, and cared for, than the children of respectable labouring men?

I think it would be a risk. As long as it is confined to orphan and deserted children, I do not think the numbers would ever be large enough to make it a practical question.

Would you not agree with me that every possible means should be taken to prevent there being any more spent upon these children than is absolutely indispensable to place them on a level with the children of the class amongst whom they are brought up?

I should entirely agree in principle; but in practice I think more is spent, and I do not think we could reduce it.

To some extent, therefore, that is an objection to boarding out?

No, I would not go that length; I would not say I think it is an objection, because I think it is a logical objection that would not be taken by the class who are affected by it.

Earl of Strafford. That was in Bedfordshire; did you pay any visit in Sussex?

No, I did not.

Putting the question of clothing aside, you are satisfied on the whole with their appearance; that proved that they had been well cared for?

Admirably, no doubt.

Earl of Aberdeen. Would you say that so long as the pauper child is not better fed and better dressed than the other children of the family, assuming that there are other children, practically no unfavourable comments would be likely to arise?

I have not heard of any jealousy arising.

If there was a better appearance in the case of these children, in dress and so forth, would it not arise rather from the interest taken by the foster parents who might keep down the expenditure to the lowest point if they were anxious to do so?

You could not suppose that the foster parents would give more interest to the foster children than their own; I do not see that that could apply. There is another thing that might account for it to a considerable extent; the interest taken by the members of the boarding-out committee.

Naturally the foster parents would have to be watchful as to taking enough care of the children?

Yes, they are under close surveillance.

You have not heard of any grumbling or discontent on the part of members of any community in the villages where these children are boarded out?

I do not think so; I think they rather take an interest in them, and feel that they are doing a kindness to these children.

They know that the children are either orphan or deserted children, and that they have a certain claim upon the public?

I think that is so.

With regard to relief, do you consider out-door relief in kind less objectionable than out-door relief in money?

I do not think that I have any very strong opinion on the subject. I do not know that it could be done in that way unless your out-door relief was on as small and reduced scale.

Would not a system of out-door relief in kind be less liable to the objection we have heard of as resulting from very inadequate relief; I mean if relief were limited to food, and so forth; it would seem obviously absurd to give to a man and his family what was quite inadequate to support life in the way of food?
You still would not get over the difficulty that the man would have other sources of income, of which you knew nothing. If you gave him 4s. worth of food, you would still allow that he earned 4s.; it would not affect that, and it would of course have the disadvantage that it would be degrading. If you are to give a man out-relief because he is a respectable person, and deserves it, it is not fair to suspect him, and load him with piles of bread.

5318. You are aware that some guardians, and others who have taken an interest in the condition of the poor, have rather a strong opinion upon this matter; perhaps you have heard that some guardians hold strongly that outdoor relief in kind is not so objectionable as relief in money.

From the point of view of preventing fraudulent applications I think it would be an advantage certainly.

5319. With regard to the rates, I think you mentioned that 2s. 2d. were the poor-rates in your union? I had a notice the other day at the rate of 2s. 2d., I think it was.

5320. Therefore the various items for which the rates are levied are mixed up; they do not give any clear idea of what the people are paying for out-relief?

Not the least; it is only a fraction of that that we spend in out-relief.

5321. Even if it was represented, perhaps it would not affect the opinion of the district very much?

I do not think so.

5322. Speaking generally of your union, would you say that the poor formed a smaller proportion of the population than in the adjacent unions?

A smaller proportion than in any union in South London.

5323. That is perhaps the explanation of the fact that in your parish the pauperism, if reckoned per thousand, is less than in any other union of South London; your ratio being 16:2:1.

Yes; that I think depends, as I have already said, on the fact that Battersea, where the poor people live, is a young district. People when they come there first married do not want parish assistance; it is as they grow old; the older settled parts will always give more pauperism for that reason.

5324. What was the purport of the Social Democratic League's representations to the board of guardians?

"That this meeting of the 'unemployed' calls upon the local bodies to undertake relief works of a useful character, and if they do not do so, it pledges themselves to march to the workhouse gates, and to stay there till relief is given them."

5325. Had that any effect upon the guardians or upon the public opinion of the district?

The guardians did act subsequently to that.

5326. In what direction?

In the direction of opening a labour yard.

5327. Lord Balfour of Burley.] This passage occurs in the article in "The Times," to which Mr. Peck made reference: "In respect of the length of time worked, the out-door pauper has a distinct advantage over the ordinary workman. In no trade in London does a week's work consist of less than 52½ hours' work. In no stoneyard does it imply more than 45; in the majority only 42; in several it is 36; in one union last winter it was actually 32. Moreover, carpenters or engineers have to be at work by 7 o'clock even in the coldest weather; the stoneyard never opens its gates till 8, and 8.30 or 9 is a still commoner hour; one union last winter only commenced operations at 10; the theory was excellent, namely, that the men would have had time to go round and seek employment before coming in; in practice, however, it was found a considerable convenience by the class of applicants, who preferred to be in bed till their wives had got the breakfast ready, and when the hour was altered to 9 a.m. the numbers
numbers promptly dropped to little more than half." In so far as any facts are mentioned in that paragraph, would they be in accordance with the information gathered by you?

There is some exaggeration in the words "promptly dropped to little more than half." The reference is evidently to our Battersea experience. There was a considerable fall, but that is exaggerated.

5328. But with that exception the facts given in that paragraph would be borne out by your personal inquiry and knowledge?

I had the papers before me from the clerks to the different unions giving the hours at which they opened. In that sense they have been verified by me personally. I have not been in all the yards myself; I have been in a good many.

5329. But you have no reason to doubt that the answers which were sent to you by the clerks of unions are accurate?

None whatever.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

THE REVEREND ROBERT HENRY HADDEN, having been called in, is Examined, as follows:

5330. Chairman.] I think you are Vicar of Aldgate?

Yes.

5331. And were formerly curate of Bishopsgate and of St. George's-in-the-East?

Yes.

5332. And you have been a guardian of the City of London Union since 1818?

Yes.

5333. You are also chairman of the Workhouse Committee, and you are manager of the Central London District Schools, and have been chairman of the Educational Committee?

Yes.

5334. I find from a Return we have here showing the mean number of paupers on the 1st July last year and the 1st of January this year, that the pauperism of the City of London seems to be the extraordinary amount of 62'2 per 1,000 of the population, the average of the whole of the metropolis being 24'2; and the ratio per 1,000 of population of those receiving out-door relief is 32'4 in the City, the average of London being 10'9; and the ratio of the in-door relief is 29'8 per 1,000, the average of London being 13'3, the population of the City of London being 51,439 at the last census; could you explain to us from what cause it arises that there is such a very large proportion of persons receiving parish relief in the City of London Union?

I think that, to a great extent, it is accounted for by the fact that those figures are based on the sleeping population of the city of London. Your Lordships are probably aware that the better-to-do people have left the City of London, and practically all we have left is a population of poor people plus a few managers of banks and so on, who are compelled to live there, and a certain number of caretakers. The population of the City of London, I think, must be regarded as almost exclusively a poor population, and so the City of London differs from every other union in the metropolis.

5335. But do you think that it is so poor a population that your explanation will account for the difference between the pauperism of St. George's-in-the-East and of the City, St. George's-in-the-East having only 33'9 against your 62'2?

No, I do not say that. There can be no doubt at all that the guardians of the City of London have acted on the policy of giving out-relief, whereas since 1870 the guardians of St. George's-in-the-East have acted on exactly the opposite policy.
5336. Can you explain to us what the system of your board is; I will just
take some different classes, as it were, of applicants for relief; I will take, first,
an able-bodied man, the head of the family, who is sick; how would you deal
with such an application as that, the man being of a respectable character?
I think that in that case the policy of the guardians would not be to posi-
tively drive the man into the infirmary; they would give him relief at home.
5337. If the man was able-bodied and out of work, and not sick, how would
that case be dealt with?
Then, at most times of the year, he would be relieved by having work given
to him at the labour yard, payment for which he would receive according to
a certain scale. If he were a married man with no children, he would receive
8 d. a day and an amount of food equivalent to 8 d.; if he were a married man
with children he would receive at the rate of 1 s. a day, also with food amounting
to the value of 8 d.
5338. Is the labour yard open every day?
The labour-yard is open every day of the week, when it is open at all. For
the last few years we have closed it for three or four months, I think, in the
summer.
5339. When the labour yard is closed, of course such persons can only be
given relief in the workhouse?
Only in the workhouse.
5340. Supposing the case is one of an aged and infirm person, but still
able to do some work, though not able to earn sufficient for the support of
himself and his family, if he has any, how would you deal with a case of that
kind?
I think, in a case of that kind, the guardians would give a certain amount
of out-door relief.
5341. To supplement his earnings?
I am afraid so.
5342. And if he was aged and infirm and wholly unable to earn anything,
would that case be dealt with by out-door relief?
Then I think the guardians would do their very best to get the man and his
wife into the workhouse.
5343. How do you relieve widows with children?
As largely as possible, by taking some of the children to the district school,
and by giving some out-relief to the widow if it is absolutely necessary,
or by leaving her to make her own way without the children.
5344. Do you require her, if she is able-bodied, to support one or more
children herself?
I think almost always.
5345. Now you have told us the class of cases where you would give out-
door relief; in what cases do you give orders for the house?
I think the policy of the guardians, if I may answer your Lordship's question
generally, is to require all people who apply for relief, unless under exceptional
circumstances, to go into the workhouse. That is the policy, I think, which
the majority of the guardians would wish to see carried out; but the City of
London claims to be an exceptional place, so that that policy is not always
acted upon.
5346. Exceptional; do you mean as regards the character of the popula-
tion?
I mean rather as regards, if I may say so, the tendencies of the guardians.
I must not be regarded as at all answering for the City of London here. I do not
say that that policy is my policy, but I think that my colleagues are sometimes,
perhaps, unduly tender hearted in dealing with these cases; certainly they do not deal
(70.)
with them on anything like the lines on which the guardians, say, of St. George's-
in-the-East, deal with them.

5347. Does your board regard itself, then, rather in the light of a board
which dispenses charity, than in the light of a board which relieves destitu-
tion?

I think that might certainly have been said to be true a few years ago.
I think a certain change is coming over the board, and a firmer method of
administration is being observed.

5348. In your own opinion, do you think that the tendency of the system
practised by your board hitherto has been to increase destitution and demo-
ralise the population?

Answering for myself, I most certainly do.

5349. Can you tell us what average number of persons you had in your
labour yard last year?

I am afraid I could not answer that. One generally finds on going there
about five or six men; I think not more.

5350. If you had no labour yard, do you think that those men would accept
offers of relief in the workhouse?

I doubt it in the case of some of them; I think that some of them are
chronics, who, if it were not for the existence of the labour yard, would simply
go their way and get work somehow, or manage to exist somehow, without
troubling us.

5351. So that as regards some, at all events, of those employed in the labour
yard, your system simply creates paupers?

I think so myself. I may just mention that some years ago we allowed single
men to come to the labour yard, and then we passed a resolution forbidding
single men to avail themselves of it. A number who would have been in the
house under almost all ordinary circumstances came into the house, and
some of them went their way, and we saw no more of them.

5352. Are no single men admitted now to the labour yard?

None.

5353. Have you had any exceptional distress in the City during the last
three or four years?

I should say none.

5354. Do you think there would be any difficulty in dealing with the whole
of your pauperism without the labour yard?

I should say no difficulty.

5355. Have you a casual ward?

We have.

5356. What is your opinion as to the value of the casual ward; do you think
it is a sound system, or are you in favour of some alteration in it?

I should abolish it. I have been to the casual ward many times; I have watched
the admission of the vagrants; I have talked to a great many of them;
I have tried to help many of them; and I think I am quite within the
limits of accuracy when I say that only in three cases have I found anything
like a hopeful case in the casual ward.

5357. You would deal with them in the same way as other applicants for
relief?

Yes; I should abolish the distinction between ordinary pauperism and casual
pauperism.

5358. Of course you are speaking now only of the metropolitan area?

I am speaking entirely for London.

5359. Have you a separate infirmary?

We have a separate infirmary.

5360. It
It has been suggested by some witnesses that clinical teaching should be allowed in the infirmary; do you think that that is practicable?
I think that it might be made practicable. At Liverpool I believe it works very well.

Do you find that an increasing number of the poor resort to your infirmary?
I am afraid there is a very strong prejudice against the infirmary among the poor. It is very odd that people who will go to an ordinary London hospital will hesitate about going into the infirmary, whereas if they were taken blindfold to either they would not know the difference between one and the other.

Your experience then is not that of some witnesses, who say that the infirmaries are so much improved now that there is not only little reluctance, but a great readiness on the part of the poor to go to them?
I certainly have not found that in my own experience as a City clergyman; there is a most absurd prejudice against the infirmary.

Earl of Strafford.] And not against the hospitals?
Not against the hospitals at all; people will go half over London to get a hospital letter when they will not go to the infirmary.

Chairman.] Are your children boarded out?
We have no boarding out in the City.

Are they sent to a district school?
They are sent to the Central London District School.

Is that a large school?
A very large school; it is the second largest school in the country.

Are you satisfied with the education given in that school?
I think I may say that I am fairly satisfied with the education given in the Central London District School, but I am not satisfied with the education given in the Poor Law schools of the country on the whole.

What changes would you recommend?
I should recommend that the orders under which they exist should be revised in accordance with the improved education of modern days. The Poor Law schools, as far as the law is concerned, stand exactly where they stood in the year 1848, and so, as far as the law is concerned, the 50,000 children, speaking roughly, who are in the workhouse, separate, and district schools are absolutely outside the Elementary Education Acts.

What are the principal points on which there is such a difference, and as to which you think that the fact of these schools being outside the Elementary School Acts causes a worse education to be given?
As it stands at present, as far as the education of the children is concerned, everything is left to the chance composition of a board of managers or a board of guardians. You may have an enlightened board of guardians or board of managers, who will decide to teach the children more than the law requires; or you may have a board of guardians or board of managers which is satisfied with the minimum required by the law. All that the law requires at this moment to be taught in poor-law schools is reading, writing, arithmetic, and the principles of the Christian religion.

Would you place the management of the schools under a different body?
I should place the Poor Law schools under the Education Department, so that the country may have some guarantee that the money voted by Parliament bears proportionate educational results; at this moment you have absolutely no guarantee.

Are you yourself personally in favour of boarding out children?
Theoretically I am indeed, because I think that, as things are going, boarding out would in many cases be a great improvement upon the Poor Law schools.
5372. Are you able to place out children from your district school advantageously when they come to an age at which they can work?

As far as the boys are concerned, there again it is dead against us. About 30 years ago the guardians of the City of London had a return made of the 45 boys who had been placed out in service for the last two years. It was found that 15 of those only were doing well, 17 were not to be found, and 13 had entirely disappeared. Again, two years ago we had a return made of all the boys who for the past 10 years had been apprenticed. They numbered 121. The cost of apprenticing them was £1,800. We found, as the result of close investigations, that only 12 had at that moment served their time as apprentices; that 26 were still with the masters to whom they had been apprenticed by the guardians; and that absolutely nothing was to be discovered about the rest of these boys.

5373. Do you recommend any change in the regulations by which you think these boys might be secured better employment?

The regulations, as they stand at present, are very bad regulations. They are 40 years old; they have never been materially altered during those 40 years; they are all based on the supposition that in-door apprenticeship will last for ever. As far as London is concerned, in-door apprenticeship is quite over; though some boards of guardians still apprentice boys to masters who receive them most obviously for the sake of the £10 premium, payable £5 when they take the boy, and £5 at the end of the first year. I am afraid that, in many cases, at the end of the first year the boy disappears, and that the £10 is of course wasted.

5374. What better regulations would you suggest?

I would suggest that the Local Government Board should give power to the guardians to apprentice boys as out-door apprentices. In the City of London we have twice over asked the consent of the Local Government Board to apprentice promising boys as out-door apprentices. In one case we apprenticed the boy as an out-door apprentice to a carpenter, the master making an arrangement with the Committee of the Homes for Working Boys, by which, up to the age of 18, the lad should receive board and lodging.

5375. Lord Balfour.] Would you explain exactly what you mean by out-door and in-door apprentices?

By an in-door apprentice I mean a boy who lives with the master who engages to teach him the trade, and who receives his food and lodging in the house with the master; but there are very few masters now who take apprentices and live on their premises. For instance, in the City a man will have a carpenter's shop, and he will live at Clapton or Streatham, because he can let the upper part of his premises for a very much higher amount than will be the value to him for residential purposes.

5376. What is an out-door apprentice?

An out-door apprentice would be a boy who was indentured to a master who was not responsible for him out of work hours, and who would live, say, either at one of the Homes for Working Boys, or live with his mother.

5377. Are these boys not from your district school?

Yes.

5378. Then are many of the boys who are in the district school children having one parent, at least, alive?

A certain number, I think. I am speaking of the two typical cases which we have put to the Local Government Board, and in one of which we got a certain amount of help, and in the other of which we got no help; indeed, in which we were not allowed to carry out the arrangement which we thought was for the advantage of the boy. In the case of the one boy the Local Government Board consented that he should live at the Home for Working Boys, and be apprenticed as an out-door apprentice to a carpenter; but
but in the case of the other, where we proposed that the boy should be an outdoor apprentice and live with his mother, the consent was not given.

5379. What was the reason assigned? The reason that was assigned was, that our proposal did not fall within the regulations under which apprentices may now be indentured.

5380. And that was so, I believe? That was certainly so, I believe.

5381. Your case now is that you want those regulations altered? Exactly.

5382. Chairmen.] Could not these boys have got employment without being indentured; in the case of the boy living with his mother?

I think in the case of the boy whom we proposed to leave with his mother that was so; the firm took the boy on without indentures. It was a firm in which his father had worked for 30 years, and there was an element of sentiment in the case which we could not expect to find in ordinary cases.

5383. Do you find it more easy to place out girls? It is very easy to place out girls. I think our girls are placed out very satisfactorily.

5384. Are you able to follow up the subsequent careers of the girls so as to know whether they have turned out well? I think we lose sight of very few of them, although I should say that we do not do our work first-hand; we do it through the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, an organisation of about 700 or 800 ladies, who look after these girls and do it most satisfactorily.

5385. Have you charitable associations co-operating with your board in the City? I am afraid very slightly. To some extent we co-operate with the Charity Organisation Society, though by no means to the extent that I myself would like to see; and there is a certain amount of communication with the Jewish Board of Guardians.

5386. Is there any other point that you would like to mention?

I should like to say for one thing that I think the Consolidated Orders all want revising, and that guardians must not be held to be blameworthy where the Orders are, I may say, ambiguous, or where they are really not helpful. There is a spirit of antiquity about them which is occasionally very inconvenient to encounter.

5387. Do you find them too restrictive, or do you think that they are not restrictive enough? I was thinking of this matter of apprenticeship for the moment; it is almost idle for guardians and managers to spend hours and hours at these district schools, when, after you have done all you can for the boy, you are confronted by an obsolete Order of the Local Government Board, 40 years old.

5388. An Order, though 40 years old, might be a wise one? But in this matter of apprenticeship we are positively restricted in putting these boys out advantageously although a large amount of public money has been spent upon their training.

5389. Can you quote any other instance?

I think that the story of the 121 apprentices is about the best instance I can give to your Lordship.

5390. Do you mean that you would like the authority to apprentice children to be withdrawn? I should like it to be revised, and I should like a much larger discretion to be given to the guardians and managers in putting those children out into the world. (70.)
5391. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is there any other Order of antiquity, which you complain of?
Perhaps "antiquity" is hardly the word; I do not object to them because they are old, but I object to them because in cases which crop up every now and then you cannot act upon them.

5392. Can you give us some more instances?
I should like to see, for instance, the discretion of the guardians in regard to the detention of casuals extended, and I should like to see further powers given to the guardians to regulate what one calls the ins-and-outs.

5393. But that further regulation of the ins-and-outs could not be done by an order of the Local Government Board; for that it would require statutory powers from Parliament?
I should like the Local Government Board to ask for statutory powers for that purpose.

5394. But now about the extension of time for casuals; what alteration in the regulations for the detention of casuals would you like made?
If one may not look forward to the abolition of the distinction between ordinary pauperism and casual pauperism, I should like the powers of detention to be sufficiently long to give the guardians an opportunity of looking into the settlement of casuals.

5395. But you would prefer to that to see the distinction between casuals and ordinary paupers done away with?
Without doubt.

5396. Is there any other point on which you think the Local Government Board's Orders require either codification or alteration?
I would lay stress again upon the advisability of revising the Order of 1848 when the curriculum of the Poor Law schools was prescribed and restricted to reading, writing, and arithmetic, and the principles of the Christian religion.

5397. Is it restricted to that?
They are the only subjects recognised by the Local Government Board.

5398. But is there anything in the Order to prevent your educating your children in any other way that you think fit?
No, certainly not. My point is that so much is left to the chance composition of the boards of guardians.

5399. Then when you used the word "restricted" that was a mistake; you said "prescribed and restricted"?
Yes, that would be a mistake, I suppose. Nevertheless reading, writing, and arithmetic, and the principles of the Christian religion are the only subjects required. I once had a letter from the Local Government Board to say so.

5400. Is there any other point on which the Orders are not up to date?
Well, I think the principle upon which the Parliamentary Grant is administered wants revising.

5401. Which are you referring to?
I ought to have explained that I meant the Parliamentary Grant for teachers' salaries in the Poor Law schools. I do not think there is any guarantee that it is being distributed in the best possible way, or that the country is getting sufficient value for the amount of money which is voted.

5402. In what respects?
I think the figures show such great disparities between schools of a similar class and containing a similar number of children, that the matter wants looking into.

5403. How far is that a necessity from the class of children with which they have to deal, and the irregularity of their attendance, being taken away perhaps in the middle of the year, and so on; and how far is it from anything which it is in the power of the Local Government Board to alter?
The class of children or the irregularity of their attendance has nothing to do with the Parliamentary Grant. I should like to see the grant distributed to the schools on the results of the examination or in the nature of a merit grant; but it seems to me that there is no satisfactory principle at all upon which the 37,000 l. annually voted by Parliament is now distributed.

5404. You would like the principles upon which that money is awarded assimilated to the principles on which the money is awarded under the Code? Exactly.

5405. Is there any other point in which you think the regulations require alteration?
I think we might have some further powers in the matter of emigration of children.

5406. As to the amount of money you may expend upon each case, do you mean?
I think a little more money might be allowed.

5407. How much more?
I do not think much; 5 l. would probably go a long way.

5408. Five pounds in addition to what you are at present allowed?
I think so.

5409. Has your board attempted any emigration of children?
Of Roman Catholic children.

5410. To what extent?
I daresay we may have sent out 15 or 20 in the last four or five years.

5411. Where did they go?
They went to Canada, and I think three went to the Cape.

5412. Was it in regard to them that you found the restriction of the amount of money you spent upon each case a disadvantage?
I do not say exactly that we found it a disadvantage, but I do not think it is quite enough; I think it would be much better if we were allowed to have a further margin, without having to apply to the Local Government Board each time.

5413. Are there any other points on which you think the orders might be changed?
I should like to see what is called parental control considerably curtailed in the matter, say of a man and his wife who are in the workhouse, or a widow who is outside the workhouse, with children at the district schools. It is very vexatious, for instance that, because the father and mother in the workhouse happen to have a disagreement with the master or with some official they should have it in their power then to spite the guardians and everybody by having the children brought up from the district schools, and taking them out for a day and probably bringing them back the next day, and then having them sent to the district schools again.

5414. That, of course, again would be matter for statutory regulation?
I am afraid so.

5415. How far would you go by statute in the direction of taking away the control of the children from the parents?
In the case of such parents as I have been mentioning I should deny that they had any rights whatever over the children; I should do what is done in some of the States of America where they say, "We cannot afford to acknowledge your rights."

5416. How would you define the point at which you would consider the parent to cease to have any right over the child?
Parents who were admittedly disreputable. For instance, I remember when I was looking into the Poor Law at Boston I met a clergyman there, who had been before a magistrate that morning and had made an affidavit, which had (70).
been supported, that the parents were thoroughly disreputable and unworthy people. On the strength of that the magistrate had deprived the parents of the guardianship of the children for ever; and they had been handed over to some benevolent association to be dealt with.

5417. Do you think if that plan were adopted, there would be no danger of a certain class of parents becoming voluntarily disreputable for the sake of getting rid of their children?
I am afraid I feel so strongly on the point that I should risk that; I think this country is so old that it should take the risk.

5418. At the present time the only causes for which a parent can be deprived of the control of his children are certain definite and easily proved offences, such as the child being the child of a prostitute, or a child wandering about without any ostensible means of control, or being found in a brothel, or something of that kind. Your proposal takes us into a class of cases which are in their nature much more indefinite and much more difficult to reduce to any rule and standard; how do you propose to get over that difficulty?
I should leave it to a magistrate; I am afraid I do not see very much difference between a man and his wife, say, who are in and out of a workhouse, who are constantly drinking and showing their children an evil example, who drag these children up and down the country for certain months of the year, who at other times of the year make for London and take these children to the lowest lodging-houses, and those parents whose offences are more easily definable.

5419. Surely it is much more difficult to establish such a charge as that of being constantly drinking than it is to establish a charge where the child is found in a brothel?
There is no doubt that that is so.

5420. Then there is a difficulty there?
I am afraid there are great practical difficulties; I was rather stating my ideal.

5421. I might not disagree with the ideal, but how would you get it defined in such words as Parliament could embody in a statute; have you any suggestion to make in that way?
I do not think it would be an unreasonable thing to say that when the children of parents who are in the workhouse are sent to the district schools they shall stay there for a given period, say three months, so that the managers may have some chance of doing some good with them.

5422. In the meantime the parents might disappear, might they not, and the child might be left wholly a charge on the rates?
No, I think in that case the parents must stay in the workhouse; I should make it a condition of receiving the children at all into a district school that the parents must stay in the workhouse for a given period.

5423. If the parents refused that condition you would be no better off than now, would you. I understand your proposal to be this; that you would refuse to receive the parents and child into the workhouse for the purpose of sending the child to the district school, unless the parents would undertake to stay in for a period of three months?
It would be difficult I know, but when they once come into the workhouse I think the law might simply say, "You must not go out for three months; you must stay here in return for having your children educated at the district schools."

5424. Would you contemplate imprisoning them three months because on three occasions they were destitute?
It would be hardly imprisonment staying in the house.

5425. It would be practical imprisonment, would it not.
In the sense that they would not have their liberty outside; but I am thinking of the class of cases where the parents do absolutely nothing for their children; and I think the State is entitled to step in and say that as they demand that the children should be kept at the public expense, they also must do their part.

5426. Do you think, that with these exceptions which you have mentioned, the orders issued by the Local Government Board are fairly well up to the requirements of the time?
I think so, but I think in two cases the exceptions are very important, and go to the very root of the matter: notably in the matter; of apprenticeship; notably in the matter of the distribution of the Parliamentary Grant.

5427. But I understood you to challenge the Regulations and Orders of the Local Government Board on all subjects of Poor Law administration?
I hardly meant to do that. I think they all might be made very much simpler; it would be no harm if they were revised.

5428. What ones, in addition to those you have mentioned, do you think could be made simpler?
I have mentioned three.

5429. But what I have asked you is, in addition to those which you have mentioned?
I do not recall any others at this minute; perhaps if I had them before me they might come back to my mind.

5430. You gave an explanation of the high rate of pauperism in the City of London Union; do you think that the explanation which you gave is sufficient to account for that very high rate without any other causes?
No, I do not.

5431. What else do you think is the explanation?
I think that in past times the guardians have given a great deal too much out-door relief.

5432. And they are now reaping the fatal effects of that vicious system of administration?
I am afraid so.

5433. And is it not the fact that in addition to the statutory provision out of the rates there is a vast sum expended out of the City charities in the province of the relief of destitution?
Yes, a vast sum.

5434. Do you think that I should be wrong in saying that the existence of this vast sum has had something to do with the number of people who are habitually living upon either charity or the rate?
No; I am sure your Lordship would be perfectly right.

5435. Have you any suggestion to make whereby that could be cured?
I think that is curing itself slowly, and your Lordships probably know that an Act was passed in 1883 for the redistribution of the City parochial charities on improved lines; and in some parishes, the action of the Charity Commissioners has already been felt; I may take as an example the parish of Bishopsgate, where I was curate for eight years; already the Commissioners have issued an order by which restriction is put upon the trustees as to admitting new people to the list of recipients of the charities; and in a few years' time I fancy a great change will be seen in that matter in the City of London.

5436. You look to a stricter administration of the Poor Law to effect a cure in assistance to the causes you have mentioned?
Exactly.

5437. Earl Spencer.] Has the inspection of workhouse schools always been under the present system?
(70.)
Since the year 1862. In the year 1848 the inspectors were first appointed and were placed under the Privy Council. In 1862 in consequence of a friction between the Inspectors of the Privy Council and the Inspectors of the Poor Law Board, Mr. Villiers, who was then President, had the Poor Law schools placed under the Poor Law Board entirely.

5438. And what is the inspection now?
The inspection now, as far as the education of the schools goes, consists of an annual visit from one of the four Educational Inspectors of the Local Government Board.

5439. And those are quite distinct from Her Majesty's Inspectors, as they are called, under the Education Office?
Quite distinct.

5440. Then up to 1862 Her Majesty's Inspectors used to visit the workhouse schools as they visited other schools?
From the year 1848 to the year 1862 the Privy Council Inspectors visited the workhouse schools exactly as they visited the ordinary elementary schools.

5441. And there has been no change of inspection since then?
No change of inspection since 1862.

5442. Are you aware whether, in this matter, it is the same all over the country as in London?
Yes; there are only four Local Government Board Inspectors for all the Poor Law schools.

5443. Lord Thring.] We have been told that the mere accumulation of a vast number of children in the district schools dwarfs their intellects, and unfit them for life. I understand that the school you are connected with is the largest in England?
The largest but one.

5444. Is it your experience that the accumulation of a large number of children has the result which I have mentioned?
I should be very glad to see the school reduced to half its size on the ground which your Lordship indicates.

5445. How many are there in it?
One thousand two hundred, nearly.

5446. And you are of opinion that the vast accumulation of children makes them mere machines; they are known as mere numbers, we have been told? They are not numbered; but I think the system is not good for the children.

5447. How long are they kept there?
We get both our boys and girls out at 14, I think.

5448. When do they go in?
None under three.

5449. During the period from three to 14 years of age they live in effect within the grounds of the district school, and have no connection at all with outer life?
If they are orphan or deserted children I am afraid, with some exceptions, that is so; but we have tried to make things a little better for them; for instance, we brought a number of them up to the pantomime one year.

5450. But is it the fact that, apart from private benevolence, these children are kept from the age of three to 14 in a state of isolation from everything and everybody except the officials?
To a great extent that may be so.

5451. And you think that a very bad system, do you not?
Yes.

5452. We were told also that it is specially injurious to girls; is that your experience?
I do
I do not know that I observe very much distinction between the girls and the boys in regard to the effects produced.

5453. You believe it is very prejudicial to both?
I believe it is very prejudicial to both. I think the girls turn out a great deal better than they get the credit of turning out.

5454. These district schools are very expensive, are they not?
Very expensive.

5455. Earl of Aberdeen.] When you make the suggestions which you do as to certain improvements which you think might be introduced in connection with the Local Government Board, you do not, I suppose, reflect upon the present form of administration, but you think that, like other institutions, as time goes on it affords scope for certain alterations?
I think that about defines my attitude towards it.

5456. Lord Thring.] Where is this large school to which you were alluding, where the children from the City of London Union are sent?
At Hanwell.

5457. And which school is the largest of all; you said that your's was the next largest?
The largest of all is Sutton; I have never been to Sutton; but I believe the Sutton children are not under one roof.

5458. Then the one at Hanwell is the largest concentrated school in England?
In England, and in the world.

5459. Earl of Strafford.] Are you a visitor of the school at Hanwell?
I am one of the managers.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Thursday next, at Twelve o'clock.
Die Jovis, 5° Julii, 1888.
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DR. JOHN HENRY BRIDGES, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5460. Chairman.] You are the Local Government Board Medical Inspector for London, I think?

That is so, for Poor Law purposes.

5461. And I think you can give us some information as to the present arrangements of the infirmaries attached to workhouses in London?

The arrangements of the infirmaries when I first began my work were those that prevailed, I believe, throughout the country. The sick wards were a department of the workhouse, and the sick poor were attended by a visiting medical officer, who was engaged himself in general practice, and who, therefore, had only a very limited amount of time to give to his work in the sick wards. Since that time the great majority of the sick poor in London have been treated in infirmaries which are under distinct administration from the workhouse, and which are superintended by a resident medical officer assisted by a steward and by a matron with a trained staff of nurses. The old system used to be that a very small number of paid nurses were engaged, on the average not more than one paid nurse for ninety sick people; the actual treatment of the sick, the actual handling of the sick, being done by pauper labour; so that the paid nurse was more in the position of an assistant matron than of a nurse. The present plan is that in these infirmaries pauper nursing is abolished, and the handling of the patient is entirely entrusted to paid nurses who have undergone a certain amount of training; and with regard to the medical superintendence, there is not merely a resident medical superintendent who has the administrative government of the whole institution subject to the board of guardians, but there is also a resident assistant medical officer.

5462. Perhaps it would be as well if you would also, before we go further, explain the dispensary system?

Before the passing of the Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867, the out-door sick were treated in the usual way; that is to say, the district medical officer visited them at their own homes, or, in the case of those who were able to get out of doors, they came to his private residence, and the district medical officer found the drugs, except in certain instances in which the guardians provided certain more expensive drugs, like quinine and opium. Since that time, in the course of the last 20 years, 45 dispensaries have been established throughout London, where the district medical officer is bound to attend at a fixed hour on every day, and where those of the poor who are able to do so come to him, he attending
attending them at their own houses as before if they are not able to come out. The district medical officer has nothing to do with dispensing. A paid dispenser is appointed who makes up and distributes the prescriptions as soon as the doctor has seen the patient. That is the system now prevailing, not with entire completeness throughout London, but in all parts of London except certain outlying districts where the population is extremely sparse.

5463. Do the patients send for their own medicines, or are they distributed to them?

Those of the patients who come to the dispensary to be seen by the doctor hand the prescription to the dispenser, and wait till it is made up, and take it away with them. Those who are in bed and are not able to come send some friend or relative to the dispensary later in the day.

5464. Do you regard the present system of infirmaries in London as satisfactory in all respects, or are there any further changes which you think are necessary to make them thoroughly efficient?

I think there are some changes, which may rather be called extensions of the system, which would be of very great advantage. The weak point of the system is, I think, that although the medical staff has been very much increased as compared with what it was, yet it has not been increased sufficiently. I should like to see the medical staff somewhat increased, in such a way as could be done without entailing expense upon the ratepayers, and I think that could be done, perhaps, in two ways. Possibly in some cases an infirmary might be so connected with one of the general hospitals that the assistant physicians and assistant surgeons of that hospital might periodically come to visit the patients in the infirmary, those of them at any rate who were suffering from obscure diseases. That is one way. And another way is that a small number of the older medical students, perhaps those who have taken their diploma (of whom there are always several connected with every hospital in London) might be invited to come to the infirmary and act as clinical clerks to take accurate records of these obscure diseases. In order to explain the importance I attach to this change, I may say that these infirmaries, and, of course, also the old workhouse sick wards, where there is no separate infirmary, contain a very large number of cases which were of old lumped together under the head of either of paralysis, or of general debility, or some title of that kind. Now one of the most important advances of medical knowledge in the last 30 years has been the careful discriminating investigation of these chronic diseases, and the discovery that they are very different from one another, require very different treatment, run a very different course, and that some of them may be sifted out as curable, especially if their early stages are detected. But in order to do this it is absolutely necessary that they should be observed with very great care and accuracy; and that is exactly what the ordinary medical officer, whether the visiting medical officer of a workhouse, or even the resident medical superintendent of the infirmaries as they now are, has not time to do. He requires, therefore, I think, a certain amount of assistance, which might be given, as I suggest, in the way of clinical assistance, in order that the disease should be carefully recorded and accurately observed. Now, I may say one word as to the objection which may occur. Why are not these obscure cases, it has been asked, sent to the general hospitals in London? The reason is a very plain one. Those hospitals are not able to receive such cases; they are cases very chronic in character, they take a very long time to run their course, and the hospitals cannot receive them; practically, therefore, the Poor Law infirmaries in London are the only places where such cases can be treated.

5465. Would the hospitals decline to receive such cases?

They would.

5466. Or do you mean that they have not sufficient accommodation for them?

They have not sufficient accommodation for them. After remaining in the general hospital for a short period they would be obliged to discharge them.
5467. Lord Balfour of Burley.] They would also object to receive the case of a man known to be chargeable to the rates at the time the application was made, would they not?

I do not say that they would always do so, because sometimes a severe acute case of disease has been taken in, even under the circumstances you mention.

5468. Chairman.] Is it within your knowledge that in other parts of the country (I cannot speak for London) the boards of guardians subscribe to hospitals for the purpose of patients being received?

That is so.

5469. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Do they do so in London?

They do so, but not so frequently as they did before the infirmaries were established; still that is occasionally done.

5470. It it not the fact that in some hospitals at least numerous obstacles are thrown in the way of the reception of those who are known to be chargeable to the rates at the time of application?

I daresay it would be regarded as an objection to admitting the patient; but I think it would not be an insurmountable objection, provided the case was one that was likely to run its course rapidly.

5471. Chairman.] But in the case where the hospital received a subscription from the guardians, the hospital authorities would be obliged, would they not, by the terms of their contract, if I may call it so, to receive patients sent by the boards of guardians, exactly on the same terms as any other patients?

The subscription to the hospital, so far as I have been concerned with it, has been regarded not in the light of a contract, but as recognition of services done.

5472. I used the term "contract," but, of course, strictly speaking, it is not so. I ought to put it perhaps in this way: A board of guardians subscribing to the hospital would have precisely the same privileges as any other subscriber:

Yes, I think that would be so.

5473. Therefore the hospital authorities would not be entitled to refuse a patient sent by a board of guardians, unless on the same ground as they would have refused a patient sent by a private subscriber?

I suppose they would not; but I understand that there is considerable discretion left in the hands of the resident medical officer of a hospital as to what cases he admits.

5474. Are you in favour of what has been suggested by some persons, that clinical teaching should be allowed in the Poor Law infirmaries, in the same way as in the general hospitals?

In the same way, but not, I think, to the same degree. I may perhaps remind your Lordship that by the Act of 1867 the provision of medical instruction was expressly arranged. I refer to Section 29 of the Metropolitan Poor Law Act of 1867, which is as follows: "Where the asylum is provided for reception and relief of the sick or insane, it may be used for purposes of medical instruction and for the training of nurses in such cases and manner, and subject to such regulations, as the Poor Law Board may from time to time by order direct." That section two years afterwards was rescinded by Parliament by Section 20 of the Act of 1869.

5475. At present, therefore, it would not be admissible; but I want to get your opinion whether you think it would be desirable that it should be allowed?

I entertain a very strong opinion that with proper precautions it should be allowed; and that in the interests of the patients in the infirmary, and also in the interests of the public. I think there can be no doubt that in many ways such a change would result in the patients of the infirmary being better treated. In the first place there would be more time given to each individual case; secondly, the resident officers, whether the medical officers or the nurses, would be kept in the highest condition of activity of all their faculties, knowing that their work was watched. All resident officers tend to degenerate into a state of indolence.
inciendence and routine, if there is no outside influence brought to bear upon them; and I cannot have any doubt whatever that the standard of nursing and the standard of medical treatment would be very considerably improved by the cautious, careful introduction of a certain number of young medical men who would record and take notes of cases, as is done in hospitals.

5476. Would there be, in your opinion, any objection to it on the part of the patients themselves or their friends?

My own opinion is that the patients, with very few exceptions, are better pleased the more attention is paid to their case, and that they would prefer such a plan.

5477. Considering the large numbers of the poorer classes who resort to the general hospitals, and entertain no objection to clinical teaching in those hospitals, is there any reason why objection should be made by practically the same class to clinical teaching in the infirmaries?

I think there is not.

5478. Since the infirmaries have been made so much more efficient and satisfactory, do you think that there has been a greatly increased tendency on the part of the poorer classes to resort to them?

I think there is less unwillingness to go into an infirmary than there used to be to go into the sick ward of a workhouse; I think there can be no doubt whatever of that.

5479. I suppose it is scarcely possible to deny that whilst there are great advantages in having a better infirmary, it must have the effect of bringing more persons upon the rates, and thereby bringing a larger portion of the population within the number of those who are receiving Poor Law relief.

I can only say that the total number of persons in receipt of Poor Law relief in London, whether in-door or out-door, has diminished since the establishment of the infirmaries.

5480. But what I had in my mind is this, that the establishment of infirmaries, equal probably to the great hospitals, may have the effect eventually of causing the population to believe that they are entitled to infirmary treatment at the expense of the rate generally?

I think it might do so, if the guardians did not take special precautions against it.

5481. Of course it has occurred to you that there is also this objection; I suppose it is one that could not by any means be removed, but the result is that the respectable poor probably get less good medical treatment than a pauper, because it is not at all probable that a respectable artisan can pay for such good medical attendance as can be obtained in an infirmary by a pauper?

That is so, no doubt. Perhaps that objection may apply equally, or to a considerable extent, to the establishment of hospitals, because there is also a very great objection in some parts of the country (certainly in Yorkshire of which I know something) amongst the respectable poor to entering the general hospitals of the district.

5482. The tendency is probably one which is unavoidable, that the more complete the gratuitous medical attendance and treatment that is provided, the less reluctance there will be on the part of the population generally to take advantage of it?

Yes.

5483. Do you think that the separation of the sick from workhouses in London has tended to better discipline in the workhouses themselves?

Of that I have no doubt. When all classes were mixed up, as they were 20 years ago, when the sick were mixed up with the healthy and with the able-bodied, it was practically impossible to establish discipline over those for whom discipline was required.

5484. Is there any other point with respect to infirmaries, or dispensaries, or medical relief generally, which you would like to advert to?

I should
I should like to be allowed to quote one or two cases illustrating what I have said as to the curability of a certain number of these chronic cases.

5485. Will you please do so?
This is a case reported to me by one of the medical superintendents of an infirmary, and a case which I have myself seen: A woman, aged 35, presented symptoms of paralysis, which would have been, on the old plan, simply classed as paralysis; she would have been allowed to be in the sick ward of a workhouse and there she would have remained for an indefinite time, perhaps for life. On careful inquiry, something peculiar was found in the symptoms presented, both in the form of the paralysis and in the form of the insensibility to pain, and in the character of certain epileptic fits that she had. She had been two years in the sick ward of the workhouse before she was transferred to the infirmary. There she received this discriminating, careful treatment, both by massage and electricity, and so on, of which I have spoken, and this woman is now in service, and is perfectly well. Another case is that of a woman of 51, who had what was called paraplegia; i.e., paralysis of the lower part of the body. She had had this for 11 years, and for seven years of this period she had been in the sick wards of the workhouse. She was transferred to the infirmary, and she also was treated in a similarly careful discriminating way, and she is now quite well. I saw her the other day, and she is quite ready to earn her own livelihood. Another case (which I did not see, but which was reported to me), in the same infirmary, was that of a woman aged 71, who had entirely lost her voice, and for whom certainly nothing would have been done on the old system. She had remained in the sick wards of the workhouse for eight months, and was regarded as a hopeless case. She was transferred to the infirmary, and she was cured by the application of electricity in two days, and she is now, although at the age of 71, about to resume her work as a charwoman.

5486. In the case of very difficult and surgical operations, which, of course, must at times take place in these infirmaries, are they always performed by the medical officer of the infirmary, or if there is anything very peculiar in the case is other assistance obtained?
In all serious operations of the sort (and many serious operations are performed in many of these infirmaries) the medical superintendent has found no difficulty in calling in from amongst his medical friends a sufficient number to help in the operation, to see that it was properly performed. Sometimes he has performed it himself; sometimes it has been performed by his friend.

5487. Taking one branch of cases, which I believe (though I have no medical knowledge) are generally of a delicate nature, anything connected with the eyes, do the guardians ever send patients suffering from such affections which require operations to be performed to special oculists?
Very generally they would do so. In one or two cases the medical superintendent has had special experience of the treatment of those cases; then he has performed the operation himself.

5488. I ask the question because it is hardly possible, of course, that any one medical practitioner should have a special knowledge of all the various branches?
Yes.

5489. And, therefore, there would be cases in which you would regard it as necessary that there should be assistance obtained?
Certainly, that would be so.

5490. Have you paid any attention to Poor Law schools?
Yes, I have had a great deal to do with the medical aspect of the London Poor Law schools.

5491. Have you found it satisfactory on the whole?
On the whole I think it might be regarded as satisfactory, but it is more satisfactory in proportion as the schools are smaller.
5492. You find that there are evils insuperable from very large collections of children?
I think there are.

5493. Could you tell us what they are?
I am speaking of the medical aspect. The tendency to the propagation of certain skin diseases, especially of ringworm, and of ophthalmia, is very much greater amongst large collections of children than amongst small collections. I think in the small schools very much more individual attention is given to each child; and, independently of that, I imagine that where a great number of children in exactly the same physical condition are placed together in the same dormitory, the tendency to the spread of that particular physical condition increases.

5494. About what number would you regard as the largest number that it is desirable to assemble in one school?
Of course it would be understood that I am speaking of those schools where all the children are practically in the same building; I am not now speaking of those large schools which are divided into separate houses; but in the case of children assembled in the same building, I should like to see no school of a larger number than about 400; that would, perhaps, 150 boys, 150 girls, and 100 children under the age of seven, called infants.

5495. Lord Balfour of Burley.] There are evils like ophthalmia that take place in institutions of a much smaller number than 400; how do you fix the limit of 400?
I am guided rather by practical considerations. I suppose that if the number is extremely small it would hardly be thought worth while to pay the superintending officers a sufficient salary; that was rather guided me.

5496. Chairman.] You would probably approve, on medical grounds, of caghtage homes of 25 or 30, which upon other grounds also have been stated to us to be very beneficial?
I should very strongly approve of them indeed.

5497. Even in small workhouse schools I have no doubt it is within your knowledge that these skin diseases and ophthalmia are very apt to prevail?
I have no experience of small workhouse schools at all.

5498. But I think we may assume that it is the fact, from knowledge which many of us have on the subject, and I should like to ask you whether, that being so, you think that the physical character of the children who are in those schools renders them more liable than a collection of ordinary children would be to such diseases?
I think there can be no doubt that the children admitted into our workhouses have a predisposition to such diseases. They are of a poorly-fed class, have a low physical constitution, and they have a natural tendency to contract ophthalmia and ringworm. We find, however, in the smaller of the London schools, those not exceeding 400 children or thereabouts, that such diseases as ophthalmia and ringworm are very easily kept in check.

5499. Earl of Strafford.] A question was put to you with regard to clinical instruction in the workhouse infirmaries; I did not quite gather from your answer whether that was authorised by an Act passed in 1867, and that the clauses of that Act which empowered clinical instruction were afterwards amended; is that the case?
That is so.

5500. Was that Mr. Hardy's Act?
The Act of 1867 was Mr. Hardy's Act.

5501. Could you tell the Committee exactly what were the powers allowed by that Act for clinical instruction in workhouse infirmaries?
Section 29 of the Metropolitan Poor Act of 1867 runs thus: "Where the asylum is provided for reception and relief of the sick or insane, it may be used for
for purposes of medical instruction, and for the training of nurses, in such cases and manner, and subject to such regulations as the Poor Law Board from time to time by order direct."

5502. And how long did that clause remain in force?
Till 1869.

5503. And do you know why it was repealed?
I do not know; I have never been able to find out why it was repealed, but I have been told that a fear was expressed in the course of the discussion in Parliament that it might be said that the bodies of poor people were dissected in workhouses, and that that would create a prejudice against Poor Law administration.

5504. During that time you were medical inspector, were you not?
No, I was not till 1869.

5505. You do not know whether any representations were made to the Poor Law Board at that time with regard to the possibility that such evasions of the Act might take place?
I have inquired, but have not been able to find out.

5506. But in your opinion there would be no disadvantage in those powers being re-enacted?
I think not; I think it would be very desirable to do that.

5507. And that it would not be objected to by the patients themselves?
No.

5508. And that in the interests of medical science and the instruction of young medical men and nurses, it would be advantageous?
Yes.

5509. You mentioned electricity; is that used generally in the workhouse infirmaries and dispensaries now?
Very largely in the workhouse infirmaries.

5510. May I ask whether you think that it is likely to be of great use hereafter in coming diseases?
I think it is a proper remedy to use, with very great discrimination in special instances.

5511. But in the cases you have quoted to us, in one or two it has been attended with favourable results?
Electricity was only one of the remedies used; it was applied concurrently with other things.

5512. In regard to the nursing, I suppose since you have been appointed medical inspector, the nursing has improved immensely, from what it was formerly?
It has improved immensely, but with very great differences of degree in different infirmaries.

5513. Do your duties take you into the country as well as London?
No, I have only three districts outside the Metropolis.

5514. Which are they?
One is Croydon, the second West Ham, and the third Richmond.

5515. Earl of Hopetoun.] Have you any gratuitous nurses, ladies?
No.

5516. Lord Thring.] With respect to the number of children in the schools, do you think it would be an advantage that in every school the head person should be able to know individually each child?
Yes.

5517. Because I believe that very good authorities indeed have said that 300 is about the utmost number that a head master or head mistress individually knows?
I would point out, with regard to that, that a school of 300 is practically (70.)
divided into three sections, more or less independent; the boys' section, the girls' section, and the infants' section.

5518. That has the effect of diminishing the number that each person has to superintend below what I said, a great deal?

5519. Should you, as a medical officer, say what some witnesses have told us, that in a very large school containing, we will suppose, 1,000 children, the intellects of the children get stunted for want of individual training?

I do not know that I should say that their intellects get stunted, so far as intellectual power is tested by book-work, and by passing the examination of the Education Inspector; possibly the motive for the establishment of the very large schools was that they would be able to pay a higher salary to the head school-master, and the head schoolmistress; but I do say very emphatically that the character of the child gets stunted, that his common sense, or her common sense, gets stunted.

5520. In fact the capacity of the child to earn its bread in the world is stunted?

I think so.

5521. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You mentioned that at times important operations are performed in workhouse infirmaries; are you able to express any opinion as to whether the consent of the individuals upon whom those operations have been performed is always carefully obtained beforehand?

My firm belief is that it is always so asked. I have made inquiries on a great many occasions, and I am not aware of any instance in which an operation has been performed without the consent of the patient.

5522. Have complaints ever been made to you of that kind?

No, I am not aware of any.

5523. There would be opportunity for making complaints of the kind to you if the practice had been in existence?

I feel quite sure that we should have heard of it sooner or later, at least I think we should; there is every possible opportunity for making complaints to the Local Government Board of anything of that kind.

5524. But to yourself personally I mean; you go round amongst the infirmaries, do you not?

Yes, constantly. I have never had such a complaint made to me.

5525. You have no reason to think that it occurs?

I have no reason to think it at all.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

MR. EDWARD L. BRANDRETH, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5526. Chairman.] You are Guardian of Kensington, and also a Manager of the District Schools in connection with that Union?

Yes.

5527. I think you desire to give some evidence as to the effect of the working of the Common Poor Fund with respect to the sending to the District Schools of the children of widows?

Yes; I feel rather strongly upon the point. The Acts under which the schools are managed are the Poor Law Act of 1867, and the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1870. Under those Acts practically all the expense of the maintenance and the education of the children, and of the establishment, is defrayed
deferred from the Common Fund. Now, at the time that Act was passed it was never the custom to send the children of widows (not only the children of widows, but of others incapacitated) to the district schools; therefore, it could not have been contemplated when that Act was passed that that mode of relief would have been given. Subsequently there was a great meeting of the metropol-itan guardians, a certain number being deputed from each board, in 1872, under the presidency of Mr. Corbett. At that meeting there were several matters discussed and passed, and we agreed to represent them to our different boards. One of the resolutions they came to was this (it was the fifth): "That in special cases of able-bodied widows with more than one child it may be desirable to take one or more of the children into a separate or district school of the union in preference to giving out-door relief." That, I believe, was the first occasion on which this kind of relief was thought of; in fact, opinions were then expressed that it was not legal to give that kind of relief. After this it gradually came into vogue. Our experience is most extraordinary. We applied it, instead of the limited way which is here referred to, to all cases of widows and others getting relief who were not in the house. Five-sixths of them in the course of a few weeks took their names off; they refused to have their children, in lieu of the out-relief, sent to the schools; in a very few weeks five-sixths of the total amount of out-door relief of that class was abolished.

5528. What conclusion do you draw from that?
We at first thought we had suppressed the thing altogether, because though a great many guardians would never have agreed to send widows into the house as a test, the most soft-hearted had no objection to the children going to the schools; but the mothers looked upon it very much in the light of workhouse relief. We caused careful inquiries to be made, and we came to the conclusion that in not one single case was any harm done, notwithstanding that enormous reduction of out-door relief. But as time went on, these schools, so far from being objected to, became very popular. The mothers and relations were sent down every two or three months, at the expense of the guardians, to visit their children, and they always came back expressing themselves highly delighted. When they applied for tickets, I took the opportunity of asking them some questions, and they expressed themselves as most grateful, and exceedingly pleased at the condition of their children. So that now it ceases to act as a test at all. I have no statistics, but I should say that in one-tenth of the cases it did not act as a test at all. Cessing to act as a test, it is a most extravagant form of relief; at least one-third of the children in our schools now are of that character. I have no statistics regarding other schools. We always require a woman to support two children.

5529. When you say that "one-third are of that character," you mean that the one-third are the children of widows?
Or others who are incurables; men who are incurables and permanently incapacitated from earning a livelihood.

5530. I understand that the practice of your board is not to confine this offer of taking the children to the district school to the children of widows, but to extend it to the children of all who are in receipt of permanent relief?
Yes, but not quite to the same extent; the widows have the preference no doubt, the other cases are very few by comparison.

5531. Let us take those two cases separately; in what way should you prefer to deal with the children of widows?
Something on the plan that was suggested here, that we should not exclusively give that relief, but that we should sometimes give out-relief, which is very much cheaper; the other acts as no test at all. I should gather rather from the evidence I have read here, that other boards of guardians require a widow to support only one child, and I should think it very likely from that, that really half the children in our schools were the children of widows or others not required to enter the house.
5532. Lord Balfour of Burley.] What reason have you for saying that some boards of guardians habitually require that a widow should only support one child?

From the evidence taken here.

5533. Where did you read it?

In the papers.

5534. Chairman.] I think you may assume that the general practice is to require the widows who are able-bodied to support two children. But to return to your reasons for preferring another system; I understand that you do so because you think it would be cheaper; but have you considered the effect on the children themselves; do you think it would be as beneficial to the children to be brought up with their parents when they are in very poor circumstances, they receiving a small dole of out-door relief for them, as it is for them to be taken into district schools?

I do think so. Of course the allowance should be fairly liberal. Where there is really a good mother I should very much prefer to see the children brought up by her than even sent to Banstead, which is our district school, and at which the barrack system is not pursued.

5535. Lord Balfour of Burley.] I should like to have your reason for wishing to diminish the sending of the children of widows to district schools; is it that it ceases to be a test?

That is one reason.

5536. Do you think that the giving of out-relief would be any more of a test?

Not more, of course.

5537. How would it diminish the number of children chargeable to your board of guardians?

I do not say it would diminish them, but if we keep up the same number it would be very much less expensive, and I also think what I have stated shows that five-sixths of those who have relief ought not to have it.

5538. How do you mean that it would be less expensive?

Every child in our school, and I suppose in the other schools, costs about 30 l. a year.

5539. And you would propose to give the mother so many shillings a week to keep the child at home?

To a certain extent. I think the different systems ought to be worked together. I think the workhouse test ought to be applied more than it is. I think the school should be used to a certain extent; and I think that where you are satisfied about the children being properly cared for outside, out-door relief for widows should be applied more frequently than it is, and not that we should have only one mode of relief, namely, sending them to the schools.

5540. Chairman.] You recommend that there should be more discrimination?

More discrimination.

5541. And that where the widow has a decent home and there is reason to think that she can bring up her children decently with a small amount of out-door relief, that system should be adopted in such cases in preference to taking all the children into a district school?

I think so.

5542. And your experience is that there is a large increase, in consequence of the present system in the number of widows applying for relief?

Very large. I may say that in 10 years our school has gone up from 300 to 805.

5543. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Surely that increase rather than being an argument against the system is an argument to show that your method of administering
administering the system has not been strict enough; you could have refused many of those cases?

Undoubtedly that is so.

5544. It is not so much an argument against the system as against your board's administration of it?

It is almost impossible to get at the bottom of things. I am sure in those cases that I have mentioned, five-sixths of which were struck off, we took the utmost pains to ascertain the facts thoroughly before we gave any relief at all.

5545. Chairman.] You told us that the children of the class of permanent paupers, not widows, were taken into your district school; is it frequently the practice of your board to offer to take the children of such persons into the school?

Yes, I should say it is; not quite to the same extent as the other, but the number of comparatively young men who have got children of that age is very limited.

5546. Therefore, the answer to my former question whether these were not principally the children of widows would be that they are principally the children of widows?

They are.

5547. And that there is only a small addition of other children?

Yes.

5548. Probably for special reasons?

Yes.

5549. Do you object in special cases to taking the children into district schools?

Of other than widows, do you mean?

5550. Yes?

No, I do not object to it all.

5551. What is the practice in your union with regard to permanently disabled or aged persons; do you usually give them out-door relief, or do they get the offer of the house?

It a great deal depends upon whether they have relations who will look after them; if there is a daughter who resides with them, or anybody who will help, we never give sufficient out-door relief entirely to maintain an aged couple or parent; but where a limited assistance, say 2s. 6d. or 3s. a week, is given, with the constant care of a daughter, then we give the out-door relief.

5552. Your practice is one which has very commonly been described as that of doles; you give small doles?

Yes, but not in the sense of doing so, if they can earn anything themselves besides.

5553. But I understand that you give them a dole which is not sufficient to support them?

Because the child or the relation will do the rest.

5554. In those cases you require contributions from the relations; is that so?

Yes, or now and then where a person is very old, she can do a little needlework and help herself; but we almost always require that some relation shall be able to look after them.

5555. But do you require a contribution from that relation towards the person's support, or do you merely give such persons a dole and leave them to get on as well as they can?

We do not collect the contribution.

5556. You do not enforce the law against relatives in that respect?

Unless they are taken into the house; then we do.
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5557. In a case where infirm or aged persons are able to earn a little, do you give an out-door relief allowance to assist them?
Sometimes we give it, but not very often; we always provide them separate quarters in the workhouse.

5558. In those cases you generally offer the house?
Generally, I think.

5559. In adopting this general practice of placing the children of widows in your district school, do you think your board has been much influenced by the fact that since the Act of 1870 the cost has been thrown upon the Common Fund?
Not our board so much, because we are a very rich parish; but I have no doubt that the poorer parishes are most eager to get the benefit of the Common Fund.

5560. I am confining myself to your parish; I want to know whether your board have any interest in putting persons on the Common Fund; whether financially they are benefited by it; being a rich board I should rather presume that they probably do not derive benefit from it?
I think that on the whole they do, because if you have got to pay for the other parishes you want them to contribute towards your expenses also.

5561. Are you able to tell us whether there is any considerable financial gain to your board from the giving of in-door relief so as to influence largely their practice?
In regard to the schools do you mean.

5562. Generally?
I do not think that as regards the ordinary out-relief it enters into their consideration at all; but in regard to the school we have a kind of feeling that if we do not send our children there we shall be keeping that school up solely for the benefit of the other parishes.

5563. Is there a financial objection, or not, on the part of your board to giving out-door relief as compared with in-door relief?
I think there is in regard to the school, but not in regard to the ordinary out-door relief. The contribution from the Common Fund is 5 d. a day in each case, and the patient in the workhouse costs 7 s. or 6 s. 6 d. a week.

5564. So that you do not think they are much influenced by the financial consideration?
Not in regard to the ordinary out-door relief, but I think they have been in regard to the school relief.

5565. In regard to the children you think that the amount of out-door relief which would be given would cost the parish more than it now costs them to maintain them in the school with the contribution that is given from the Common Fund?
Yes, undoubtedly it would. Our individual parish pays one-seventeenth of the Common Poor Fund, so that we have to deduct that from every case in which we get the benefit of the Common Poor Fund.

5566. Some witnesses have given it as their opinion that it would be advisable to abolish casual wards; have you formed any opinion on that?
I have a very decided opinion against their abolition. The casual ward was established by us in the year 1879; I mean to say on the separate system; we had it in the workhouse before. In 1878 the numbers for the half-year ending Lady-day were 5,768; after the establishment of the separate system in 1879 the numbers were reduced to 3,887, but in reality the deduction is very much greater, because it took in all the Chelsea people as well as our own. The casual ward is abolished at Chelsea, and, as a rule, they will send over to us. The reduction in numbers went on gradually till it fell in 1887 to 1,812, but last year it has risen again to over 4,900. I think that is from exceptional causes connected with Sir Charles Warren's proceedings and the expectation of lodging-
lodging-house tickets. And then another reason against abolishing the casual ward is that we should lose the benefit of the Local Government Board inspection. If the whole of these casual paupers were absorbed in the workhouse we should not have the benefit of the inspection that we now have.

5567. Does the Local Government Board not inspect the workhouses?

The Local Government Board does; but there is a regular periodical inspection of the casual wards, and those casuals that have been detected as habituats and gone into other houses within the month, are detained an extra number of days, two or three days, I forget exactly what the time is. I think we should lose the benefit of that inspection altogether if they were absorbed in the workhouse.

5568. You mean that if there were no separate casual class, there could be no such inspection of that class as now exists?

That is what I mean.

5569. You do not think that the bringing of the casual poor into workhouses, in the same way as other paupers, would diminish the class?

I do not see why it should; I think it would rather increase it. The proof of the advantage of the separate system in our case is the great reduction that I have mentioned; that has gone on steadily. And if they went into the workhouse, they would associate with others and do what they liked. But they are constantly going from the casual ward to the workhouse afterwards, if they want to remain in the parish.

5570. Have you a labour yard in Kensington?

We have no labour yard; we abolished it 15 years ago.

5571. Do you think that that abolition was desirable?

I think most desirable.

5572. And since you have closed your labour yard have you found any difficulty in dealing with the cases in the winter?

Not the very slightest. We never have more than 12 able-bodied people in our workhouse at one time, and never more than one married man; and those are the sort of men.

5573. Will you tell us whether, when you had a labour yard there, were many men employed in it?

Twenty years ago we had 700, and that meant about 3,000 people in receipt of relief; the normal number was about 500; it has fallen down to one case now. I do not consider that single men ought to be given relief at all; they are often not given it at all in the stone yard. We have never had more than one married able-bodied man in the workhouse.

5574. In your view labour yards to a considerable extent produce pauperism?

I have no doubt of it. Perhaps I might mention that when we abolished ours a great many of our guardians felt that there might be respectable people to whom it would be rather hard to set them to stone-breaking or oakum-picking; and therefore we started a carpenter's shop and a mat-making shop; and I may mention here that we have an able-bodied workhouse; we take into it the able-bodied poor of a good many other parishes besides our own.

5575. You have a separate able-bodied workhouse?

Yes. Our own number never exceeds 12, and we take up to 90 from other parishes. We started these shops, and we requested the other parishes that they should send up any respectable poor with the mark A. 1, so that we might put them to mat-making or carpentering; never one came.

5576. How are the men employed in your able-bodied workhouse?

Either in oakum-picking, or in stone-breaking, or in corn-grinding.

5577. And you would be of opinion that if there were proper test houses of that kind for able-bodied men, labour yards in London might entirely be discontinued?
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I think
I think so; from our experience we are often hurt that the really respectable poor will not come in, and that therefore it is no test at all. The philanthropic people tell us that it is no argument if nobody comes into your workhouse that there is no distress. It strikes me that if there was great distress there would be a certain margin that would overflow into it.

5578. You probably draw a distinction between distress and destitution; and in the case of men actually destitute, without lodging or clothing, you think they would necessarily take advantage of the relief so offered in the workhouse?
Yes; I do not mean to say that there is not a very great amount of distress.

5579. You draw a distinction between distress and destitution:
But there is no destitution; practically none.

5580. Your union is, I conclude, one in which there is not a very large number of poor in proportion to the whole population?
We have about 600 in the infirmary and 800 or 900 in the workhouse.

5581. That is at the present time?
At the present time, in the winter rather; I do not know how many there are at this moment.

5582. I hardly think that those figures can be correct, because by the Return which I have before me of the mean number of persons relieved on the 1st of July 1887, and the 1st of January 1888, it appears that the number of in-door paupers in your union was 1,854?
That is a greater number than I have stated; that must include the children, I think, in the schools.

5583. This is a "Statement, showing the mean number and the ratio per 1,000 of population of paupers relieved in the metropolis on the 1st July 1887, and the 1st of January 1888, excluding vagrants and lunatics in asylums, &c."
It includes the schools, which I did not intend to.

5584. Therefore you were referring only to those paupers in your workhouse?
Yes, and to the winter, not to the summer.

5585. This return would include all the children?
Yes.

5586. I see that the ratio per 1,000 of the population in your union, according to this Return, was 11:3 of indoor relief as compared with 13:3 for the whole of the metropolis; and the ratio per 1,000 of the out-door relief was only 2 as compared with 10:9 for the whole of the metropolis. Therefore I may conclude from that that your administration of out-door relief is strict in the Kensington Union?
No doubt it is strict.

5587. Are you personally of opinion that that strict administration is desirable in the interests of the poor themselves, as well as of the ratepayers?
I think so; I do not know whether I go quite as far as some of our guardians do in the matter.

5588. Has it been much stricter of late years than formerly?
Very much stricter; but it has been very strict for a great many years. I suppose we had 5,000 on out-relief, as far as my memory goes, when I first became a guardian.

5589. And I suppose I must infer from your previous answer that it is rather from the general opinion of the guardians that out-door relief is undesirable, than from financial reasons connected with the Common Fund, that your administration of out-door relief has been more strict?
Quite so; I think that acts as well. I may mention that I have often heard even from the President of the Local Government Board in comparing proper returns, a mistake which is often made by others, and that is this: in referring to the past they say that there has been a great diminution of pauper relief, but in
in reality the returns are fallacious for this reason. If you take one person into the workhouse out of a family of 10 only one person appears as a pauper, but if you give that one person out-relief in a family 10 appear.

5590. But why do you regard that as fallacious?
Because when they say there is a great reduction of pauperism it is not really so, not to the extent that is supposed.

5591. If out of 10 persons one only receives relief, the reduction is great?
But if there is one only receiving out-relief in the family, a man, then they go down as 10.

5592. You mean that if the head of a family receives out-door relief then the whole family will be entered as paupers?
I believe if any one person in a family receives it that is the case.

5593. Lord Balfour of Burley.] How can any person not the head of a family receive out-door relief?
In the case of a sick child. With the weak children of widows it is reckoned in the same way; we should take one or two to the school; perhaps two go down as paupers; but if we give relief to the widow in her own home the whole family go down.

5594. But she is the head of the family?
She is the head of the family.

5595. Chairman.] But in the one case the widow and the child or two children that she supports are not paupers; they are not receiving any relief?
But, practically, it is out-door relief under another form. If you take two children, and send them to the school, and in that way help the widow, who is living outside, surely it is practically the same thing.

5596. Then, with regard to the one man who comes into the workhouse, in what way do you draw any conclusion as to the returns being fallacious?
That one man only goes down.

5597. He is the only person receiving relief in the case supposed?
Yes. But if you gave him relief in his own house, the whole family would go down as paupers.

5598. Because he is the head of the family?
Yes.

5599. In the one case you pauperise one man only, and in the other case you pauperise the whole family; is not that so?
It does not strike me in that light; it seems to me exactly the same thing.

5600. Do you board out your orphan and deserted children, or are they sent to the district school?
We used to board them out, but we never boarded out more than 25; that was the maximum that we ever had when we sent our children away to be boarded out. When we sent our children to Anerley, we did not think so much of the barrack system, and we boarded out a certain number, but since we have had our school at Banstead, we have not boarded out any at all.

5601. Is that because you think the school system preferable to the boarding-out system?
I think so in regard to the boys; I could not say in regard to the girls; but certainly in regard to the boys we think the district school is preferable.

5602. Might I ask on what your experience is based; did you find that the boys when they were boarded out were not well attended to, or what was the reason?
We had much greater difficulty in placing them out than we had from our own school. As a rule, the boarding-out committee do not help very much.
I may mention a few cases from Thkelton, in Suffolk, I think, where we had some six or eight or 10 children boarded out. Two came as pages to London, for instance; that was not quite what was expected.

5603. Do you regard that as an objection?
No; but we did not expect that, coming from the country, they would be sent up to be page-boys in London.

5604. But was it any objection?
No; but sending them down to the country, we rather expected that they would be absorbed in the population.

5605. You look upon the boarding-out system, in fact, as one by which you can put off the children on the labour market in the country; is that the idea?
That is rather held out as an inducement to us. In two of the cases they did get provision for them down there. In two other cases, we had to do what we have never done with regard to our own district school-boys, we had to continue to pay them half wages after they got employment; they could only earn 1 s. 6 d. a week, and that was not enough to support them; and we had to give them something more too. Two were returned; they could not do anything with them at the workhouse. As a rule, the boys did not get into the families of artizans, and families where one might have hoped they would have followed the trade of their foster father, but they were taken generally into labourers' cottages; and never in any case that I know of were they taught to expect to practise the trade of their foster father.

5606. And none of them went to agricultural labour?
No, as a rule they did not. I mentioned two who got this 1 s. 6 d. a week, and we had to supplement that when they went to farm labour.

5607. Have any of your children emigrated?
Yes; we have returned to emigration the last two years, in consequence mainly of the great overcrowding of our school.

5608. And have you sent many away?
We have sent every one that we could; every orphan and deserted child of the proper age.

5609. Is the number large?
Not many. This year we sent 13 boys and 10 girls; those were all we could find.

5610. Have you heard in any way whether they have done well?
Not yet. We have heard of their arrival, and they have written some letters to their foster parents describing the voyage and so on. They were very much pleased with what they saw. We used to send them out from the Surrey School, and we were not very satisfied then; we did not get any reports about them, and at my suggestion our board wrote to the Local Government Board, and drew a comparison between the want of care in regard to the emigrated children and the care they took in regard to the boarded-out children, requiring constant reports; and we said that if what we heard was true about emigrated children, everyone ought to be emigrated; but we wanted to be made more certain, and then they sent out, in consequence of our correspondence, Mr. Dogle, who made a very unfavourable report, and for some years after that emigration was entirely discontinued, but two years ago they made fresh arrangements. The President of Agriculture in Canada has guaranteed an annual inspection and report of all children who may be sent out, whose names should be furnished to him. Encouraged by that we have sent out all the children we legally could over 10.

5611. You opened your new infirmary in Kensington in 1872?
Yes.

5612. Are you satisfied with the working of that infirmary?
Very; rather too satisfied; it seems to attract the people to such an extent now. I think when we opened it we had about 250, as far as I remember. It was built for 372, and now it has gone on to upwards of 600.

5613. Do
5613. Do you find that this improved accommodation for the sick attracts a
good many poor persons who previously did not obtain relief from the rates?
I have no doubt whatever about it.

5614. Do you think there is any laxity upon the part of your board in giving
medical out-door relief?
I do not know that there is any laxity, because I think they have different
views on the subject. Some think that they ought to be sent in at once, and no
out-door relief given at all; and others think that it should not be left entirely
to the doctors and relieving officers, to send them in without the guardians
having anything to say to it, which is practically what they do, as soon as a
certificate is given that the infirmary is recommended.

5615. You do not as a board scrutinise those cases at all?
They scrutinise them so far as seeing whether any relative can pay anything.

5616. But you do not scrutinise the cases so as to ascertain whether the
people could have paid themselves for their medical attendance?
We do; but it is difficult when people are out of work; we cannot get behind
it. If there are any relations we can make pay, we do.

5617. Are any of your poor in medical clubs, or do they look all of them to
the infirmaries or hospitals?
Scarcely any are in medical clubs; it is a very rare thing to find them.

5618. Are any in benefit clubs?
It is a very rare thing to find them. We were formerly much more strict
about medical relief than we are now. There is a provident dispensary next
door which we use to try and induce people to join, and with some effect. I
do not know whether it is owing to the fact that now there is no judicial
disqualification, but I think the feeling has grown up to some extent that the
public are entitled to gratuitous relief.

5619. Is there any other matter on which I have not asked you on which you
desire to give evidence?
No, I think not.

5620. Earl of Aberdeen.] In your experience do the girls or the boys do best
at the district schools?
I think the boys do the best. The girls do well everywhere as a rule.

5621. But not so well as the boys in the district schools; I mean as regards
obtaining situations and keeping them?
We think that ours do. I have got a return here of the 125 visited.

5622. You have not had any complaints as to failures on the part of the girls
who have left the district schools?
Yes. I think we consider that about 5 per cent. go to the bad. We have them
carefully inspected up to 20 years of age.

5623. You mean that they are followed in their situations?
Followed in their situations, and as a rule it comes to pretty much the same
percentage every year, 5 per cent.; and the others are fairly satisfactory.

5624. Earl of Strathord.] Are there children from any other unions at Ban-
stead School except from yours?
From Chelsea.

5625. From no other part?
From Chelsea and Kensington.

5626. Earl of Jersey.] You said that it cost you about 30 l. per head per
child in the district school?
That includes the cost of the building. As regards the cost of the school, we
are below the average.

5627. What is the cost of the school?
The average cost throughout London, according to the last return, is
23 l. 9 s. 1d.; out of the 33 schools we are thirteenth on the list, our cost being
21 l. 3 s. 9 d.
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5628. Earl of Milltown. I understood you to say that whereas a kind of test a child was taken from a widow and sent to a district school, the result was that five-sixths of the applicants for out-door relief were struck off? Yes.

5629. I suppose before they had been put on a certain amount of inquiry was made as to whether they were in a destitute state? We made nearly all the inquiry we possibly could make.

5630. Have you any idea what became of the five-sixths who were then struck off? We could not discover that there was any difference in their circumstances whatever.

5631. But the loss of out-door relief surely must have made some difference to their circumstances? We often thought it would have done so, but we were not able to ascertain that any suffering was produced by it in any way whatever.

5632. If that test does not meet with your approbation, what test do you propose in substitution before they get out-door relief? My point is that that has ceased to be a test at all.

5633. What test do you use now? Only that test, whatever it amounts to, of sending the children into the school.

5634. That still continues? It has ceased to be the test it once was.

5635. Do you propose anything instead? Our experience shows that the house ought to be offered more than it is.

5636. But I understand that you are in favour of the continuance of out-door relief in certain cases? In certain cases, those we are best satisfied about, where the children are well taken care of.

5637. In what cases would you have any test? In a doubtful case, if the woman is not of very good character, or is a person of doubtful character, or if her home is not good, the test of the house is a very effectual one. I should be very much in favour of applying the test of the house in such a case, and when the woman behaved herself well in the house, letting her go out and have out-door relief.

5638. I understand you to say that you approve of the system of casuals being kept in a class by themselves? Yes.

5639. Does that approval depend upon having the separate system, as you have at Kensington? Mainly, I think.

5640. Supposing you had not the separate system, should you still be in favour of detaining casuals as a class by themselves? Not as a rule. There would in that case be practically very little difference between the treatment of a pauper in the casual ward, and the treatment of a casual in the workhouse.

5641. Lord Balfour of Burley. I suppose you mean an able-bodied pauper? Or any description of pauper; there is practically no difference between the treatment of the two.

5642. Earl of Milltown. Except that they cannot come in and go out of the workhouse in the same way? They cannot come in and go out of the casual ward any more than they can come in and go out of the workhouse.

5643. They can go out on a certain day? If the superintendent chooses to allow them he has great latitude, and so has the master of the workhouse.

5644. What
5644. What power has the superintendent of the casual ward to detain a man?
The Act of Parliament gives him power to detain him two nights and a day.
5645. But after that he can go?
So he can from the workhouse.
5646. Are you of opinion that there is a large floating population of casuals
pure and simple in the metropolis as some witnesses have stated?
I think there is no doubt about that.
5647. Supposing that to be the case, do you think that the system of casual
wards is likely to foster and encourage that class?
I do not see why it should; because they can take their discharge from the
workhouse in exactly the same way. When our casual ward was part of the
workhouse we had a much greater number of casuals.
5648. If there was exactly the same treatment of casuals as in-door paupers,
and they could go in and come out in the same manner, what would the object
of the distinction be?
Because we have the separate system.
5649. I was putting the case where they have no separate system?
Then I think it does not make much difference whether you have a casual
ward, except as regards the inspection, which I think a valuable thing.
5650. Lord Balfour of Burley.] I think I understood you to say that some
proceedings of Sir Charles Warren's had increased your number of casuals
during the last autumn?
It is only my idea.
5651. What proceedings?
The paupers sleeping out in the open spaces, and that sort of thing; I do
not speak with any confidence about that.
5652. At what date would that be?
I could not answer certainly about that, it would be within this year.
5653. Did your increase of casuals take place subsequent to those
proceedings?
It has taken place up to Lady-day last.
5654. But can you trace the increase which has taken place to those pro-
ceedings; can you say that it took place either directly subsequent to the
proceedings that you refer to or gradually subsequent to them?
There was an immense increase immediately subsequent to them, and Sir
Charles Warren wrote to us and proposed that we should give lodging-house
tickets. We were averse to doing that, and we said, "We will take care that
nobody shall be turned away from this casual ward," and we gave instructions
to the superintendent to see that nobody was turned away, and, if he had not
room for them, to give them shakedowns in the dining-room.
5655. You are referring to the proceedings in Trafalgar-square?
Yes, and elsewhere.
5656. Why should the proceedings have affected your casual ward more than
any other?
I do not know that they did; I do not know what the results have been
elsewhere; I only show that there has been a great increase in our casual ward
which took place just at that time.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
The Reverend Charles Henry Bowden, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5657. Chairman.] You have been Chaplain of the Kensington Workhouse, have you not?
Yes; for four years.

5658. When did you cease to be chaplain of it?
Last January.

5659. You are now chaplain of Guy's Hospital, I believe?
Of Guy's Hospital.

5660. I suppose your visits to the Kensington workhouse gave you an opportunity of seeing how the arrangements of the workhouse were conducted, and you could, perhaps, mention any points to which you think our attention should be directed?
I visited it every day; and, perhaps, I should say, that I know not only the internal arrangements of the Kensington Union I have made a personal visitation of various others; the union of Staines, for instance, in Middlesex, and Midhurst, in Sussex, and St. Marylebone, and St. Saviour's, Southwark.

5661. Perhaps you will confine yourself to the metropolitan unions?
Other metropolitan unions I have visited are the Strand and Hackney. I may also, perhaps, mention that I am secretary of the Association of Poor Law Chaplains. We meet very often, and I have gained from our meetings a great deal of information about the internal arrangements of other Poor Law unions. I think, if I may be allowed to suggest it, that the greatest evil that one meets with (and one meets it over and over again) in the Poor Law Unions, is the want of classification of the people. I mean of classification according to their character. According to their outward circumstances, whether they are able-bodied or not, or whether, in the case of women, they should be separated and put into a "pregnant ward," a classification is sometimes made; but it does not by any means follow that there is any sort of classification according to character; and that is a grievous fault, because in some cases it spreads the very evil that the Poor Law wants to avoid, and, if possible, to cure. Take the case of pregnant women, for instance. I suppose in Kensington union we had on an average 100 every year; most of them were unmarried, but a few were married, and, I may say, that I always dreaded to see a married woman there; usually, her previous life had been so very wretched, and she had lived in the midst of such dreadful surroundings, that she was a positive source of evil in that ward, and especially among young servant girls who had come up to London, and perhaps fallen once, and had come in for their first confinement, and were not in any sense vicious characters.

5662. You mean that the married women were more vicious than the single women?
Far more, the married women, that is, who came in to be confined; it was very sad, but it was so. And then another point with regard to classification is this: I think there is always a very large sprinkling, perhaps a much larger sprinkling than one suspects, of those who belong to the criminal class; and in the sick part of the workhouse and in the infirmary especially, these people are mixed in just with anybody who happens to be sent into the ward. I have a case in my mind now of one man who has been convicted over and over again, both as a burglar and as an habitual drunkard, and the last time I saw him he had on one side of him a dying consumptive, and on the other side he had a young boy of 14, who had nothing particular the matter with him, who occasionally had fits, and at other times was quite well; and yet this boy was side by side with this habitual drunkard and regular burglar, well known to be so; they became fast friends, and it was astonishing to see the difference in the character of that boy, even in the short time he was in the infirmary. I could
could go on multiplying instances of that sort, I think, almost without end; but I will only say that I am quite sure that the greatest evil that one has to contend with in the Poor Law unions, is the want of a classification according to character, and not according simply to outward and visible circumstances.

5663. I understand that what you recommend is, that there should be an inquiry into the character of each person coming into the workhouse, and that all vicious people should be put together, and all respectable people into another ward?

Quite so, and that they should be kept in separate buildings altogether; that there should be no chance of intercommunication.

5664. Do you not think that such a classification might be attended with some difficulty, that there would be apt to be complaints from paupers who were placed in the vicious class, on the ground that their characters had been defamed and that the guardians had treated them unfairly. That is another point I perhaps should have mentioned. No doubt the complaints at the present time would be many and very bitter, but they would be complaints which I think on investigation would be found to have no just ground at all. At present it is almost useless to inquire into the antecedents of paupers; I mean to say for any official to do so.

5665-6. Would it be possible to give power to any authority to examine into the antecedents of every person coming into a workhouse with a view to determine whether those persons were of vicious character or not?

I think it would be possible.

5667. Would such an inquiry be conducted on oath?

In some cases, perhaps.

5668. Then I apprehend that it would be necessary for the magistrates to conduct the inquiry in each case?

Why should not the guardians be empowered to do so.

5669. Do you think it would be likely that Parliament would give the power to the guardians to examine on oath?

I think your Lordship is the best judge of that.

5670. Is there any precedent at all for such authorities, not judicial, examining on oath?

I know of none at present.

5671. Whilst I quite see the force of your remarks as to the contamination of respectable persons by being thrown with vicious characters, I must still press upon you whether you do not think that the practical difficulty of an investigation of each case would be extremely great?

It would be at first, I quite confess; but I think we should have to let bye-gones be bye-gones, and not investigate the character of those at present in the place. In the cases of those who may come in future, I think it is quite possible.

5672. The result would be that a man would go out from the workhouse branded with the designation of a vicious character?

And I think most deservedly in the greater number of cases.

5673. But would it not almost necessarily happen that in some cases, with the best intentions, mistakes might be made; and would there not be a very strong objection felt to men whose only crime, as far as their going to the workhouse was concerned, was poverty, being subjected to a quasi-judicial investigation as to their antecedents and previous conduct?

There would be a feeling against it, and a very strong feeling too; but I think one need have no fear of the result; I think very little injustice would be done. Mistakes sometimes happen in a court of law; nobody, therefore, dreams of doing without the law courts.

5674. Short of that, might it not be possible to take care that no lads who were known to be respectable should be allowed to associate with known bad characters; might not some provision be made, without special investigation, that lads at all events should not associate with bad persons?
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5675. Then there, again, amongst the lads themselves will be found some thoroughly bad?

Some thoroughly bad.

5676. Then, again, take your first example of the pregnant women; it would be an awkward thing, I suppose, to say that a married woman was specially qualified for the vicious ward?

Very awkward. She comes in wearing the ring, and she is ready to produce her marriage certificate. I think, if I may be allowed to suggest it, no real advance can be made in the improvement of pauperism without a knowledge of the antecedents and characters of the people you have to deal with. Unfortunately the books and the official returns contain simply the statements of the people themselves, and in quite 75 out of every 100 cases the statements are false. If you challenge the men to prove their points, and if you investigate the cases yourself, you find that the statements are false, in 75 out of every 100 cases, and I am quite sure that you cannot deal with any effects unless you know the causes; you must know the lives and the characters of the people you have to deal with; and, I think, if I might be allowed to urge it, that the guardians should have more power to detain a man while the inquiry is being made. I do not think anything can be done without those two conditions being fulfilled, knowing the character and antecedents of those with whom one has to deal, and detaining them while the inquiry is being made. It is a burning question, is the question of detention, I know, but it is absolutely essential if pauperism is to be dealt with scientifically.

5677. In London, the difficulty of thoroughly investigating cases by the guardians is considerable, I suppose; more so than it would be in, for instance, a rural district or a small town, where everyone more or less is known to everyone?

Quite so; people of course go about so much in London from one union to the other; and if they find one union beginning to be uncomfortable, because people there know too much about them, they take their discharge on 24 hours' notice, and go off to another union.

5678. Are those paupers not removed back to their place of settlement?

They refuse to give any information, even their right names, when they go to the other place, or they give other false information; it is exceedingly difficult, almost impossible to trace them.

5679. Apart from the want of classification, are you satisfied with the management of the workhouses as far as you have observed it?

I think I should be prepared to recommend very large changes indeed in the constitution of the boards of guardians. They deal with this very important question from a more or less amateur point of view. Skill and experience go for nothing in the matter of managing Poor Law relief. I mean to say that, for instance, the master who very often has been in Poor Law work for years and years, and has had to deal with thousands and thousands of different specimens of the clients of the Poor Law, is not able to vote; he is not able as of right to explain any opinion; he has simply to answer questions, and it is true I am afraid that in many boards of guardians (it was not true in Kensington) they do not trouble him with many questions; they prefer to rely upon their innate sense of right and wrong rather than upon the skill and experience of the master and others.

5680. What change would you make in the appointment of guardians?

I would give the representatives of the ratepayers the majority, of course, but I think that the higher officers, the doctor for instance, as representing the thing from the medical point of view, and the clerk as representing it from the legal point of view, and I think the chaplain as representing it from the moral and religious point of view, and the master as representing it from the administrative point of view; those four should sit on the board and speak just as a member of the board does and vote as a member of the board does. They mix
with the people daily, and have a more correct idea than any amateur can have of the daily work and life of those in a Poor Law union, and yet all their skill and experience goes for nothing.

5681. Would the ratepayers of the parish be satisfied to have a voice given to the officers appointed by themselves?
That leads me to another point; I would like to see the officers appointed by the Local Government Board entirely; those four I mean.

5682. Lord Balfour of Burley. Would they not possibly get the power very largely into their own hands and rule the board?
Not if you gave the representatives of the ratepayers the majority.

5683. But is it not the case that practically the permanent officers of any board know the business better than any other people, and that they would absorb a large amount of power if they had the right to vote, which you suggest, given to them?

No doubt their opinion and advice would have great weight, and so it ought to have, but they would be considerably out-voted. At Kensington we had 18 guardians chosen by the ratepayers; those four officers, apart from their advice, could do very little against such a number.

5684. Chairman. Is there any other alteration in the constitution of the board, of guardians that you recommend?
I do not profess to have thought the matter out at all, but the Poor Law touches criminal life, and touches also voluntary charities, and it seems to me that the magistrate of a particular neighbourhood might with advantage attend the board meetings or the relief meetings at all events. So also might representatives of voluntary charities.

5685. Lord Balfour of Burley. They are members, are they not? Justices of the peace are, but not acting magistrates I think.

5686. Chairman. With regard to a class we have heard of very often, known as ins and outs, have you formed any opinion as to any mode of treatment that might be adopted to mitigate that evil?
They certainly should be detained.

5687. You think there should be a power of detention for a longer period than at present?
I do not know of any power at present, beyond the giving notice twice in a month, and that sort of thing.

5688. You would recommend a greater power than that?
Until a man's case is known, I think he ought to be kept behind by the guardians in the workhouse.

5689. For how long?
I would keep him till he gives information which helps the guardians to come to some decision as to the treatment of his case. The present system is very bad in that way that a man can refuse to give information to the guardians at all; and the result is that very often they do not know what to do with the man; they are obliged to let him stay; and when he gives his 24 hours' notice they are very glad to say good bye to him.

5690. But when they had ascertained all that was to be ascertained about the man would you then give them any different powers from those which they now possess as to detaining him?
I think it would be desirable. There are some men who certainly do spend their time in going round from house to house; I think they should be led to feel that they are living at the ratepayers' expense. Some men are taking holidays even at the ratepayers' expense, and that is a thing which the State cannot allow or approve of.

5691. Did you visit the district schools connected with the union of which you were chaplain?
I do not know them at all; they were far away from me at Banstead.
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5692. Was
5692. Was it part of your duty to visit the infirmary?
Yes, the infirmary and the workhouse. We had an average of 500, I suppose, in the infirmary, and of about 900 in the workhouse, at Kensington.

5693. We understand that at Kensington there is a separate workhouse for the able-bodied?
For the able-bodied men; only the able-bodied men.

5694. Is there any other point you would like to mention to us?
There is one point which I omitted, I think. I spoke of it as a very desirable thing to separate the vicious from the non-vicious, but I think also the classification is very desirable from another point of view. It is a very great hardship to the respectable people (and there are a few respectable people in every workhouse), that they should have to live constantly with the vicious.

5695. Earl of Aberdeen.] Do you think it would be desirable, even if there were no investigation into character before entering the workhouse, if it appeared, when the inmates had been a few days in the house, that they were of respectable character, that it should be possible to place them in a department where they would not be in contact with the depraved?
I think the sooner they are separated from the depraved the better.

5696. I am alluding to the difficulty of ascertaining, before entering the workhouse, as to the characters and antecedents of the applicants; would not the difficulty in that way be partly got over?
Would you suggest that directly they come into the workhouse? No investigation has begun before they come into the workhouse; and when they come in would you put them in a ward by themselves while a number of preliminary inquiries were being gone through?

5697. I was alluding to the opportunities for observation which the attendants and the master might have of the characters of the persons. We hear that there are some who have a very respectable and quiet demeanour who turn out afterwards to be rather difficult characters to deal with?
That is quite true.

5698. Would it, do you think, be possible to arrange that persons bringing to the workhouse before their admission any testimonial to character from some clergyman or other person of public position, should be on that ground placed in a separate department?
It should be easily possible to arrange it so, and it would be a very desirable step to take, I think.

5699. Do you think that would get over some of the difficulties pointed out in your previous examination, as to the invidious character of anything like an inquiry into antecedents, and also the subsequent objections?
I do not think it really would: even the testimonials would have to be challenged, I am quite sure. I dare say you have people coming to you now with letters which cannot be relied on. I very often have beggars coming to my house at Guy’s with letters purporting to come from clergymen, and even those letters are not trustworthy in every case.

5700. Chairman.] Might not the testimonials be forged, or, if genuine testimonials, might they not be passed from hand to hand?
It is extremely likely.

5701. Earl of Aberdeen.] Recognising that there would be a considerable amount of trouble required in order to carry out any system of classification, do you think that the need of classification is so great that the trouble and difficulty ought to be faced?
I do not think the trouble would be so very great. The respectable people to be separated out from the others are few in number comparatively, and the very
very young are practically separated at the present moment, excepting in the infirmary. They are sent to the district schools.

5702. But do you think that some sort of investigation would always be necessary, that even the experienced officials of the workhouse might be deceived if they depended merely upon appearance and demeanour?

I think it is extremely likely. I have one case before my mind now, of a girl who came in, a nice quiet girl; everybody said what a nice girl she was, and how well-behaved, and all that sort of thing; and she turned out to be a noted bad character in the particular neighbourhood of Kensington from which she came, and she did a deal of mischief while she was in the place; I think it is extremely doubtful whether she was not a procuress; I think I could almost prove it if I were put in a court of law. Yet she seemed a very attractive person, very nice, and well behaved in every way.

5703. That would point still more to the need of classification, would it not?
Yes, classification and investigation.

5704. When you were connected with the Kensington workhouse, did the master and other permanent officials attend the meetings of the guardians; were they in the room at the time they were discussing?
If they were called in, they were there.

5705. Do you consider it would be a desirable state of things, if it were the custom of the guardians, that the master and other officials should take such part as is often taken by officials upon boards of companies, for instance railway boards, where the general manager, though he does not sit there as a director, is always present to give his opinion, and so forth?
I would like to see the permanent officers always present, and giving their opinion.

5706. Earl of Milltown.] In one of your earlier answers I think you said that the want of classification defeated one of the main objects for which the Poor Law exists; did you not say so?
I think I did; which means, I suppose, that the Poor Law exists to help to remedy poverty as well as to relieve it; to help to do away with poverty as well as to mend it.

5707. I was going to ask you what, in your opinion, is the main object of the Poor Law?
The main object as it exists at present is simply to relieve destitution.

5708. Would classification enable you to relieve destitution better?
I think the main object of the Poor Law as it exists at present is simply to relieve destitution, but ought it not to go further, and help people out of their destitution.

5709. You want to make the workhouse a reformatory?
A reformatory, certainly.

5710. But as it cannot be discovered now even where these people come from, how do you propose to ascertain their characters?
I would detain them until I got the information, until they gave me a clue.

5711. Do you mean that you would put them to a kind of torture or imprisonment until they confessed?
I think they would very soon confess if they felt that they could not go out at 24 hours' notice, having defeated you altogether in not supplying you with any information.

5712. In fact, you would imprison them until they became penitent enough to tell you all about themselves?
I think they would very soon tell you about themselves if they felt that they had not that freedom which they have now.
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5713. But is it your proposal that they should be imprisoned until they gave that information?

Imprisonment is a strong word to describe it by.

5714. Forcibly detained against their will?

Yes.

5715. And when you had released them from their durance vile, on their having given information to you, how could you ascertain whether it was correct?

You would have to make inquiries outside, of course, and I think you would often find that the pauper belonged to another parish; that he had a settlement in the country, and ought to be chargeable to a country union. In the cases of pregnant women you would find very often the name of the father, and you could make the father (who is often able to do it) help to support the child. It seems to me monstrous that an honest ratepayer should have to support the illegitimate children of such a man.

5716. How could you get the name of the father?

The mother can supply you with information.

5717. I suppose if she wished she could now proceed against the putative father?

Yes, but she does not often wish.

5718. I should like you to explain how it is that the married women are so much more vicious than the single women who come in to be confined; are these married women not looked after by their husbands?

Of course in the majority of cases the husband looks after them, but they have generally passed through such a series of troubles and misfortunes, and they have so generally come from common lodging houses where they have seen any amount of evil, that they are sources of evil.

5719. It sounds rather startling at first when one hears that the legally married women who come into the workhouse in order to be confined are more vicious than the single women who come in for that purpose?

It was very startling to me when I found it out, but I think if you were to ask a series of ladies who worked in that particular ward at Kensington, they would tell you exactly the same.

5720. Then if you were to separate these women into two classes, one representing the sheep and the other the goats, the goats would be the married women and the sheep the unmarried ones?

Not at all.

5721. It sounds rather like it?

Certainly I should not class the single women under the sheep. Sometimes they come in with their third and fourth child, and they certainly ought not to be treated as sheep.

5722. But, as a rule, the married women are the more vicious of the two?

As a rule, the more vicious of the two.

5723. Earl of Hoptown. Did you express an opinion about the casual wards?

I have had no experience of them. We had no casual ward at the Kensington workhouse; it was in a separate part of Kensington altogether.

5724. Lord Thing. You recommended that the permanent establishment, consisting of the people you mentioned, should sit as a matter of right with the guardians; but have you not found that wherever an officer sits as a matter of right with the governing body it is absolutely impossible for the governing body to find fault with that officer?

It follows, one would think, from first principles. But is it true of the Houses of Parliament to take them as illustrations ready to hand?

5725. That
5725. That being so, is it not found absolutely impossible to govern any establishment properly where the permanent officer sits with you, for that very reason that the very fault you want to find you cannot find without one of two things; you must either blame the officer in his presence, and talk it over in his presence, or, do what is equally bad, ask him to go away while you discuss it?

Might I modify that recommendation of mine so far as to say that some representatives from the Local Government Board, the central authority, having skill and experience in dealing with Poor Law questions, should sit on the Board, and I desire to add that a board of guardians has a wider subject to deal with than the mere government of an establishment.

5726. I quite understand the necessity of consulting the permanent officers, and always asking them their opinion; but I was very much surprised that you should say that you thought they ought to sit with the governing body as a matter of right; I want to know now whether on consideration you think so?

I think that their skill and experience should always be available, and not simply in the form of answering questions.

5727. But that could not be done by asking them always, "What have you got to state for the information of the Board"; but I think you would find it impossible to conduct any business with efficiency if the permanent officials as a matter of right sat with the governing body?

I think their skill and experience ought to be made available for dealing with pauperism. At present it is practically lost to the country.

5728. Chairman.] The Local Government Board, you are aware, perhaps, have the power of nominating guardians?

Ex-officio guardians.

5729. And they might, if they pleased, if they thought it expedient, nominate persons of skill, supposing that such skilful persons had a sufficient qualification in the district; you are aware that that is so?

The Local Board Government Board, I know, can nominate ex-officio guardians, but whether they can in that way send persons of skill I cannot say.

5730. But if there were any persons of skill in the district available they could do so?

Only justices of the peace, I think.

5731. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.] There must be a property qualification; they must be rated for the relief of the poor in the district, but subject to that the Local Government Board may, if it sees fit, nominate persons?

I was not aware of that.

5732. Lord Thring.] Does not it, in your opinion, amount to this, that you think it would be very advisable that the Local Government Board should in certain cases have power to nominate experts or persons of skill to sit with the guardians, and that in all cases the guardians ought to pay greater attention to and consult more their subordinate officers?

I think that would lead very much to the same as the present state of things, that simply questions would be asked and nothing more.

5733. Earl of Aberdeen.] With regard to your proposal as to detention pending inquiry, do you consider that respectable people would be willing to undergo such detention if it resulted or were likely to result in their being in the end not classed with the disreputable inmates?

I have not any doubt about it at all.

5734. That would perhaps, in your opinion, get over the difficulty suggested about the "durance vile" which would be necessary while inquiries were being made?

(70.) 4 K 3 I think
I think so. There would be no hardship in it to the respectable; a respectable man only comes in when he is on his very last legs and knows he must stay.

5735. He would have to up with the confinement?
   He would have to put up with it in any case.

5736. And with that special confinement that you referred to?
   I do not think he would feel it a grievance at all.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That this Committee be adjourned to Monday, the 16th instant, at Eleven o'clock.
Die Luna, 16th Julii, 1888.
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Earl of Jersey.  Viscount Gordon (Earl of Aberdeen).
Earl Spencer.  Lord Bishop of Rochester.
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Earl of Strafford.  Lord Sandhurst.
Earl of Kimberley.  Lord Thring.

The Earl of Kimberley, K.G., in the Chair.

The Reverend J. W. Horsley, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5737. Chairman.] I think you are the Secretary of the Church of England Central Society for Providing Homes for Waifs and Strays?
Yes.

5738. And you have given attention to the treatment of children under the Poor Law?
My attention was first called to the subject when I was chaplain of Clerkenwell Prison. My knowledge of the Poor Law comes in three ways only: first of all from finding in prison a great many people who deliberately preferred prison to the workhouse, having had experience of both; secondly, from finding the invariable results of the workhouse training of girls as evidence in the characteristics of the young women I met in the prisons and penitentiaries; and thirdly, from my present work, which takes me all over England and Wales, and brings me into personal contact with guardians everywhere.

5739. Earl of Aberdeen.] Will you mention how long you were chaplain of Clerkenwell Prison?
Ten years.

5740. Could you state briefly the opinion at which you have arrived with reference to the effect upon girls of the training and discipline of workhouse schools?
They were quite distinguishable as a class; you could pick them out; the female warders could always pick them out and say, "That is an institution-bred girl; a workhouse school girl." I found that over and over again. I have supplemented my own opinion by writing to all of the most experienced prison chaplains, and female workers in penitentiary work, and they gave me exactly the same evidence.

5741. Are you acquainted with the Society for Befriending Young Servants?
Yes; and I used to send nearly all the cases I had in prison to them. Their chief Home is near where I live, and my wife is on the managing committee of it.

5742. We have had evidence lately to the effect that the results of inquiry as conducted by that society did not bear out the suggestion that the training (70.)
schools, however unsatisfactory in some respects, led to the girls going wrong as regards moral condition?

In a good many cases they do. I do not know if you have examined an extremely able lady, the head of that home, Grosvenor House, Miss Whitworth, sister of the Rev. William Allen Whitworth, Vicar of All Saints', St. Margaret-street. I was talking to her the other day on that very point, and she certainly said there was great evidence of immorality. Some schools produce more immorality, others more incapacity, others more temper and so forth.

5743. Are you speaking of immorality at the time of leaving school, or do you refer to subsequent failure?

Subsequent failure from incapacity to meet the temptations of the world. As Miss Ellice Hopkins put it, 'a girl brought up in a cottage had a horror of them rude boys punched into her from the first.' A girl who has been brought up in the semi-conventual life of a district school, where we have 600 girls massed together and known only by their numbers, does not know what the temptations are or how to meet them, and she more readily falls.

5744. Could you give us an estimate of the proportion of girls brought under your notice as prisoners, who have passed through these schools?

No, I could not; a great many, and that is the experience of all others; I wrote to Miss Hopkins, of the Streatham Institution; the head of the Diocesan House of Mercy; matrons, and many others; they all said the same thing. They are a class by themselves; they have the same characteristics, and are turned out of the same mould.

5745. These persons to whom you refer are connected with penitentiaries?

Yes; I am chaplain myself to Lady Wilson's Home of Mercy, and we have had a number of district school girls there. They are not more vicious than others, but more incapable of virtue; passive, sluggish, backboned.

5746. Have you formed any opinion as to the improvements which are feasible in the direction of curing this evil?

Yes; by being as enlightened as our Colonies, and abolishing workhouse schools. You are probably aware that in Australia they are rejoicing now in having no children in workhouse institutions.

5747. Would you substitute boarding out?

Boarding out, placing them in small voluntary homes, and emigration.

5748. Lord Balfour of Burley.] When you use the expression "workhouse schools" do you mean a workhouse or a district school?

I mean both, especially district schools. The evil is exaggerated in district schools, where you have 600 girls sometimes in one mass; in other cases, 400 or 500.

5749. Earl of Aberdeen.] Do you consider that boarding out wisely administered would be a practical remedy for the defects which you have observed?

Perfectly so. In that we should only be following the example of Scotland and Ireland, where they adopted that plan 30 years ago, and 'of every other civilised country in which it exists; even in Finland they board out every child of the State.

5750. As far as you have been able personally to observe do you think that the guardians of the poor, generally speaking, are in favour of boarding out?

No, they are not.

5751. To what do you attribute that?

Partly to ignorance, partly to prejudice. Last week I met with two intelligent gentlemen of position, one was in Somersetshire and another in Devon, who assured me that the children in their workhouse only cost them £2 10s.
2s. 10d. a week, all charges included; which is simply nonsense. Of course while they think that they will not pay 4s. a week for boarding the children out.

5752. Chairman.] May I ask why you think it nonsense?
Because a prisoner in prison costs 2s. 7d. a week for his food and clothing alone, and you will find that the guardians exclude the establishment charges; they ignore doctor, matron, teachers. All the establishment charges. The other day I visited the Epsom Board of Guardians by invitation; as the result of that they have given me the whole of their orphan and deserted children to place out. They were asked first of all what the cost was; 4s. a week was the answer. "That is the food and clothing; what is the real cost;" "We cannot do it under 8s." I have now boarded many of their children out at 4s., and placed them in voluntary homes at 5s.

5753. But is there not some slight fallacy in your calculation, because the establishment charges would, in all probability, remain nearly the same in the workhouse whether the children are there or not, with the exception of those specially charged with looking after the children?
Yes; but then the workhouse accommodation will not be so great in some cases; you do not want to build a new addition.

5754. But, as a general rule, the workhouse accommodation, in rural districts at all events, is considerably above that which is necessary?
Yes.

5755. Therefore, does it not follow that in making calculations you cannot reckon upon there being any very considerable reduction in the establishment charges if the children were not there?
I think the answer to that is that Ireland and Scotland deliberately adopted the system 30 years ago because it was cheapest; one from thrift, the other from poverty. Then other large boards, like the Leeds board, bear testimony to the fact of their having saved largely to the rates. The Blue Book published in Victoria last year will tell you that they claim to have saved 20,000 l. by the adoption of the boarding-out system.

5756. Earl of Aberdeen.] I understand you to say that even if it could not be shown that the boarding-out system, or any other system, was cheaper than the district school system, you think that the other advantages gained by another system would be considerable?
It would pay even financially, by the cutting off of the entail of pauperism and avoiding their return to the workhouse afterwards as paupers, and looking upon it as their rightful and necessary home. I may say that we took a child from the Fulham Guardians the other day; the cost there is 12s. a week they tell me. The average cost of a child in a workhouse or district school near London is from 24 l. to 30 l. a year.

5757. You mentioned just now that you could place children in homes for a certain charge; will you describe the kind of home to which you refer?
There are a large number of voluntary homes established. One I was close to last week is one that Lady Clinton has. Some lady or group of ladies establish a nice little orphanage near their own homes, and look after it with the assistance of their neighbours. If the home is properly managed it can receive a certificate from the Local Government Board Inspector and their guardians can send children to that home to be depauperised. The society I am working with has already eight such homes. There are already in existence 157 of these certified homes in which they can be received. These are chiefly voluntary little orphanages, or homes, in which the girls are quite apart from pauperism; they never hear of the guardians again.

5758. Has there been time for this system to become generally known?
Yes.
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5759. Are
5759. Are the Poor Law guardians increasingly making use of it? They are increasingly using it, but there is a prejudice. Last week I was told in Devonshire, in one place, the guardians would not hear of boarding-out, or any way depauperising the children, because they said it would deprive them of the power of getting cheap servants from the workhouse; they liked to get a girl cheap from the workhouse as a drudge.

5760. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Who did that information come from? It came from the vicar of the parish, who I am pretty nearly sure, was a guardian himself; that was the reason, he told me, given by the guardians there.

5761. It came to you through two or three people, and has not been tested by yourself? No; but there are very mean prejudices in that way.

5762. Earl of Aberdeen.] From your own personal experience and observation, have you had reason to think that that view operates upon the minds of the guardians? It does sometimes. The more usual view is that the suggestion of removing the children from the workhouse is an insinuation that the guardians do not do their duty towards them, which, of course, is not in the least intended.

5763. Chairman.] How have you formed that opinion, that the guardians are actuated by that motive? By constantly communicating with them. They have said that to me themselves. They said they could not be better treated. "Do you mean to say they could be better treated? They could not be better treated than they are in the workhouse."

5764. Earl of Aberdeen.] Are you referring also to the district schools? I have not known much personally of the district schools; I only know them by the results; but these guardians are guardians of country workhouses chiefly where there are a small number of children. In other places it is that the officials feel that their craft is in danger. I know a case in which the matron said, "Well, supposing you adopt the boarding-out system, what would become of me?" That was the way she put it.

5765. Chairman.] Was that a matron especially engaged to look after the children? She was the head of a district school. A lady was proposing to her the boarding-out system, and the matron said that they were well treated already; but when the lady said, "I know the contrary from my own personal knowledge," the matron said, "What would become of me if you boarded the children out?"

5766. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Did I understand you to say just now that you had no personal experience of the district schools? I have not been into one. It is very difficult, you know, to get into any workhouse. No guardian, as such, has a right to enter the workhouse for which he is responsible.

5767. I think that is not strictly accurate; you can do so by permission of the committee, and all the visiting committee have the right to go in; and that visiting committee is appointed by the guardians as a whole; that is so, is it not? Quite so.

5768. Beyond that visiting committee, no one has the right to go in without permission? That is exactly what I say; no guardian has the right as such.

5769. Have
5769. Have you ever known of any cases in which guardians have been refused permission?
Yes. I can give you a case that has occurred this month, in which the vicar of a parish, who is a guardian, and lives close to the workhouse, can only visit that workhouse for a fortnight in the year; a rota is prepared by the guardians; and that particular fortnight he happens to be in Switzerland; so that for the whole of the year he has no right.

5770. Has he applied at other times and been forbidden?
Applied to his colleagues, do you mean?

5771. Has he ever applied to go into the house and been forbidden at other times?
No, I cannot say that he has.

5772. Chairman.] Are you aware that where there is a rota of guardians appointed in that way, it is generally understood that the board are extremely glad if any other guardian will take the trouble to visit, and that the rota is only intended to secure the visit of some guardian?
Yes. Some guardians, who are more enlightened, constitute the whole board into a visiting committee.

5773. But may it not occur to you that probably if it were simply left to all and none were specially told off, the result would be that none would go?
No; that would be a great reflection on the character of the guardians.

5774. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Or might not the other objection arise, that in populous places where there are large boards of guardians, so many might go as seriously to interfere with the routine of the house?
I do not think so.

5775. Chairman.] Are you aware what the ordinary duty of a visiting committee is?
Yes.

5776. You know that it is their duty to visit once a week and make a report?
Yes.

5777. If no special persons were told off to make that report, would not the probability be that the duty not be performed at all?
Still, people could undertake to be responsible for certain weeks.

5778. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is not that what is done by the roster?
Certain people are there and their visits are expected, and therefore they are comparatively valueless.

5779. Chairman.] But that assumes that they visit upon certain days?
Yes.

5780. But is there anything to prevent the visiting committee from doing that which is done by visiting committees in many institutions, namely, visiting on uncertain days?
Guardians have told me that it is impossible for them to get in without giving notice.

5781. Do you exactly believe that the visiting committee on the board of a workhouse cannot get into that workhouse without notice at any hour?
Practically they do not.

5782. But do you believe that they cannot?
They have told me so. I have no knowledge of it myself.

5783. But do you believe it?
Yes; I do.

(70.)
Then do you suppose that the master of the workhouse would deliberately neglect his duty and lay himself open, as he would, to very severe reprobation and possible punishment?

I think if a guardian presented himself unexpectedly he would be told that no notice had been given of the visiting committee's approach.

Would you agree with me in saying that if any such attempt was made by a master of a workhouse, he would be guilty of most grave dereliction of duty, and would be subject to severe reprobation and possible dismissal?

I am very glad to hear that. I will quote that, I know one case in which a guardian visited the workhouse unexpectedly, and it was reported to the board by the master at the next meeting that the gentleman had been "discovered" in the kitchen.

Have you seen a pamphlet by Miss Louisa Twining, who has had great experience in Poor Law administration, in which she states that it seems very strange that guardians should not have the right or opportunity of entering the workhouse from time to time?

Quite so.

Chairman.] You understood that I was speaking of the visiting committees at that moment?

Yes, I should desire to extend it to all, or that the whole board should be the visiting committee.

Your condemnation of the district schools, so far as the girls who have passed through them are concerned, proceeded mainly from your observation of those who have passed through them, the schools connected with the workhouse?

Yes.

But I understood you to include in that condemnation the district schools as well as the workhouse schools?

Chiefly the district schools.

Why chiefly the district schools?

Because they are more numerous there. The larger the number of girls you have together the worse are the effects produced; girls suffer from massing.

But all the district schools are not large?

Our society never would put more than 30 girls together in any home; they consider that as the maximum, and that you create institutionalism if you get more. The smallest district school contains 150 at least, I think.

Your condemnation of district schools would extend to those having so small in number as 150 or 200?

Yes.

Have you thought of what can be done with those children as to whom it is not certain that they will remain long?

You mean the children of the ins and outs?

Not necessarily what we call ins and outs, but those as to whom, without their being the children of ins and outs, you are by no means certain that they will remain long, because their parents may take their discharge on any day?

The only category of children you can practically depauperise now are the orphan and deserted children.

Then your remarks as to the proper education of children chargeable to the rates would apply mainly to those who are orphan or deserted?

So very at present, because the State at present does not exercise guardianship over those children who have a parent in the workhouse.
5796. Is there any other way by which those children who are not orphan or deserted can be dealt with than in some such school as the district schools? You can have, as Kensington, Birmingham, or Shoreditch has, the cottage home district school. There you have a group of 20 or 30 girls under one mother in a cottage. They have adopted it, knowing it is a great amelioration.

5797. Are you able to say from any results at your command that those who are bred up in those cottage homes are less likely to come to grief than those who come from the district schools? The result of my observation of homes of all kinds all over England would lead me to that; I find a girl transferred to us by the guardians rapidly becomes another being when placed in one of our little homes; the child becomes humanised and individualised; not number so-and-so, but Mary Smith. We have a large number of Poor Law children under the care of our society.

5798. You admit that the success of the system of boarding-out depends entirely upon the careful selection of the homes? Not merely that, upon the supervision also.

5799. Is it in your opinion certain that a sufficient supply of suitable homes can be got at any moment? I have no doubt whatever on that point. We have a plethora of foster parents all carefully selected and well recommended, and each with a lady to supervise the child if placed with them. We have strings of foster parents; more than we can send children to. I have about 300 children boarded out by our society, and we have a plethora of homes.

5800. What district of the country do you refer to? The whole of England and Wales.

5801. You are aware that in some of the Midland counties, as reported by Miss Mason, the Inspector of the Local Government Board, some difficulties has arisen in the selection of suitable homes? I know Miss Mason, and I am also aware that the Midland counties provide some of the very best homes. I sent some 16 Epsom children to Atherstone, lately. In one of the villages in that neighbourhood, in which we have children of our own boarded out, not only are they good parents, but the cottage is a shilling a week, and coal 6s. a ton, and there is plenty of employment between coal work, factory, and agriculture, so that they can do very well for the children.

5802. There is no doubt that some difficulties have occurred, and that it is by no means to be supposed that all boarding out is necessarily successful? Miss Mason has erred on the side of over-particularity in some instances I think

5803. What do you refer to particularly? That in one or two cases she has made more of certain things that she did not like than she needed.

5804. What do you refer to? I refer to one or two cases that she reported adversely about, cases where I think she a little erred on the side of particularity.

5805. In what way do you think she is over particular? I mean that the ladies who have lived in that place, and have seen the foster parents day after day have not agreed with her.

5806. But do you doubt that Miss Mason saw the things which she reports that she saw? Not a bit.

5807. If she saw those things, is it not certain that those children were not properly cared for? I do not think you can argue from one day to what is the usual course.
You might find a child one day without stockings, and it might have stockings the other 364 days.

5808. Chairman.] Or it might not?
Then the supervisor would find it out.

5809. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Then there were serious allegations as to the personal cleanliness of the child and that of some of the other inmates of the home?
I think it is most desirable that there should be inspection; I think that is the best thing the Local Government Board ever did, appointing Miss Mason.

5810. Chairman.] When you spoke in the early part of your examination of abolishing workhouse schools, I suppose I am right in understanding you to mean that you would substitute cottage homes for workhouse schools where such schools are still indispensable; that is, for children who cannot be permanently boarded out, and the rest you would board out?
Yes, and I hope that eventually the State will assume the guardianship of those children, which at present it does not.

5811. In reference to those children, in what way would you propose that the State should assume the guardianship of them?
By saying to the habitual tramp, you are incapable of bringing up this child; I, the State, am the father of the child.

5812. That would apply to the children of tramps; but with regard to the children of parents who are only in receipt of relief for a short time, two or three months, how would you deal with those?
I do not know. You could send them to a cottage home for a short time.

5813. So that it would be necessary to have some institution such as cottage homes for the purpose of receiving those children?
Yes; you cannot deal with the whole of the children. At the present moment there are 269,000 children under the Poor Law; what I propose meets the case of many thousands of them, not all.

5814. Your observations, I think, applies principally to girls; what is your opinion with regard to boys?
Boys do not suffer nearly so much from massing; boys of any class can stand it better. I have sometimes, not often, found the bad effects of institutionalism on boys; but boys and girls are quite different.

5815. Lord Bishop of Rochester.] Do I understand that you altogether object to the scheme of district schools for workhouse children?
Altogether.

5816. And you would rather not suggest what is the smallest number you would think possible to be trained and supervised with any great advantage?
Our society deliberately came to the number of 30; we never would put more than 30 girls together in one place; and a smaller number is desirable. It is a matter of expense largely of course.

5817. Of course it is nothing to you that very large buildings have already been erected at immense cost?
No. That argument applied in Australia; but our Australian cousins threw it overboard in consideration of the children.

5818. Have you any personal knowledge of unkindness or neglect shown to children in the district schools?
No, no personal knowledge, except in this way, that I consider it unkindness and neglect that it should be actually not an uncommon thing that girls remaining in the workhouse up to the time they are fit for service should not be supplied with night garments; I do not think that conduces either to sanitation or habits of decency.

5819. Another
Another witness has given us his opinion that one objection to the district schools is that children are somewhat mechanically trained there; is that your view?

Undoubtedly; everything is done for them.

I am bound to say that I have confirmed them in many instances, and I have in some cases been very much satisfied with what I have seen; but my knowledge is not individual. If children were boarded out to the extent you propose in private houses, how would you ensure kind and just and personal treatment there?

First by a very careful selection of the foster parents; secondly, by the inspection of visitors of the local committee or boarding-out committee under the Poor Law; and thirdly, by the visits of Miss Mason. In our own case we have with each child a lady who has to report to us once a quarter as well.

You would want a good many Miss Masons to carry that out?

But you would not want so many Miss Masons to inspect them in the house.

Has your society any difficulty in finding ladies on the spot who would be willing to look after these children?

Not a bit; there are many certificated committees waiting for children; others are disbanded, because they cannot get the guardians to send them children, and they are very much discouraged in that way.

Chairman.] With reference to what you said as to the cost of children in the workhouse, I conclude that your view is this: that the 2s. 10d. would not represent the whole cost?

Nothing but food and clothing.

And that at any rate some considerable addition must be made for the establishment charges?

Yes.

Even although the whole of the establishment charges might not be affected by the absence of the children?

Yes; but these particular guardians solemnly affirmed that 2s. 10d. represented the whole cost for all purposes.

Lord Balfour of Burley.] There is no doubt that the district school is an expensive school?

Yes; it is the most expensive of all ways of dealing with the workhouse children.

Chairman.] The observations I was referring to did not refer to district schools, but workhouse schools; and in the case of the district schools, the expense is, 30 l. a year per head?

£. 24 to 30 l.

Therefore there can be no allegations against the guardians that they are actuated by a desire to save the rates in keeping the children in the district schools.

No, the allegation is that they do not save the rates.

They are probably therefore acting in the way which they believe to be for the best interests of the children?

Yes.

Earl Spencer.] In the case of Epsom, was it a workhouse or a district school?

A workhouse, containing children.

Earl of Aberdeen.] What you would specially desire to see with reference to children would be, either a larger adaptation of the boarding-out system, or a system of small homes?

Boarding-out, sending them to voluntary homes, or emigration, and then fourthly, having a number of cottage homes instead of the big ones.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
Mrs. CHARLES, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5832. Earl of Aberdeen.] In what way has your experience in regard to workhouse children or other parts of the Poor Law administration been gained? I have been a Poor Law guardian in Paddington nearly eight years, and I was a manager of the West London District Schools at Ashford for three years, and made a very careful study of the condition of the schools and their results during those three years.

5833. Can you give us your opinion, based upon personal experience, as to the relative effects of district schools as compared with boarding-out, or other systems of dealing with workhouse children? The effect of the district schools, especially upon girls, is exceedingly disastrous, because they are taught to move at the ringing of a bell, and to do exactly what they are told in a direct line, and as a consequence they actually lose their faculties if they have been there a long time. I found those that had been brought up there from early childhood, had actually as I considered, lost their faculties; that they were imbeciles artificially created. We know as a scientific fact that if you do not use the powers that have been given to you, especially at that age when the powers are all awakening, they are lost; and by a careful study of the conditions of those children during the three years, and after they had been returned one after the other to the Paddington Workhouse, I have found that that is absolutely a fact, that they have no versatility of mind. When they go into service the charge against them is that they are sullen. Now, it is not that they are sullen, poor things, but when they are told to do a thing new to them they stare at you in utter vacancy; and because they are not entire imbeciles but can do what they are told in a direct line and can do a few things, it is supposed that they have all their faculties; but, as a matter of fact, they are said to be sullen, but they do not know what you mean, and they sit down in a helpless sort of way. I placed many girls in service, and went to their mistresses, and watched their careers, and I was obliged to conclude that the girls had absolutely lost their faculties, and that to a certain extent they were imbeciles.

5834. With regard to such girls is it inevitable that they would be more easily led astray than girls of more experience of the world? You mean in the direction of an immoral life?

5835. Yes?

I am not quite certain about that. They would, of course, fall hopelessly a prey to designing persons, no doubt of that; but I do not think that their tendencies altogether would be in that direction; I should not be prepared to say that. I have only had one or two instances that I could really prove in which they have gone astray.

5836. You do not agree with, at least, one previous witness who was here, who stated that he had reason to think that a very large number of girls from the district schools went wrong?

I have heard so, but I could not speak from my own experience; but I think it is, that they are thrown out of their places so constantly that they are really driven to very great extremities, and in that way they take to an immoral life; I have found one or two who came from London district schools to the Paddington workhouse. Notably, we had one the last week, who came in with a baby. She had been brought up at Sutton schools, and the opinion of the officials in the workhouse being, that she was one of the worst characters they had had all the summer, and I think it is generally said that
that those girls who come in in that sort of way are the most hopelessly corrupt, and hopeless of characters in every way, their faculties being stultified by the training they have received; they have no cultivation of their natural senses.

5837. May we understand that you consider that this drawback may or does exist without any special blame attaching to the managers and to the officials of the school, but that it is the fault of the system? It is the fault of the system. I am not prepared to say that if you had a genius at the head of this school, who had a tremendous power of organisation and enormous personal influence, something might not be done, because such a person would, of course, devise improvements; but in the way in which they are found to work, the common-place sort of way in which they must work, I think there is no remedy at all. It is rather a painful thing. Of course, if there is one weak woman who is a matron, and she has only half-a-dozen children, she spoils the half dozen; but if she has the control of 400 or 500, it becomes a very great disaster; and I have found that the matrons of those schools are not quite what we could desire that they should be.

5838. What system would you like to see substituted?
I should like to see boarding-out as far as possible; and the plan of taking children from their mothers and sending them to a district school by way of giving them poor relief, I think is a mistake. It would be far better, in my opinion, I having had very considerable experience, to give the poor widows a little out-door relief, and allow them to keep their children at home. It acts in this way also upon the mothers. They find that they can part with their children, and throw off their responsibilities; and it is not right for anyone to be allowed to throw off the responsibilities she has voluntarily incurred. That is another evil of the district school system, that Poor Law guardians will give widows relief in the shape of sending their children to these schools; then the widows are free, and I am sorry to say I have known many instances where the widows have not conducted themselves as well as they would have done if they had had the responsibility of their children at home.

5839. Then would you be in favour of sending girls to voluntary certified homes, under the control of the guardians, but to a voluntary home?
I suppose it would be unavoidable.

5840. I am speaking of cases where there is some reason against their being sent to their parents?
I would extend the boarding-out system, I think; I would rather board them out if the boarding-out system could be extended. Now we can only board out children who are under 10 years of age; but if we could board them out at any age, I think the difficulty would be overcome at once. I am not much in favour of any certified homes; they are all something in the way I have described, though, perhaps, not quite so mechanical.

5841. A home of only 25 or 30 children would not be liable, would it, to the same drawbacks and risks as a large school?
Not if they have anything to do; if they have anything to cultivate their faculties. Then I would point out another great evil with regard to girls in these schools, that they have not the slightest idea of economy, and they have not the slightest idea of how to spend a shilling to the best advantage, which, of course, as servants, and afterwards as poor men’s wives and as mothers, is of the greatest importance for them. The way in which they are trained, by their diners being weighed out for them, is not such as to give them this knowledge; the girls used to have to clear the dining hall. Clearing the dining hall meant throwing away the food. I have seen half legs of mutton thrown into buckets, and taken out into the manure yard, or to feed pigs; and when they go away they have not the slightest idea of economising food. And that was one of the faults found by those who took these girls from me as servants; they found that they used to throw the pieces of bread upon the fire. Some poorish people, lodging-house keepers and others, who took these girls, had to return them at once, because they could not stand such extravagance.

(70.)
5842. With regard to these matters, do you draw any distinction between district schools and the workhouse schools properly, so called? No, I think there is very little difference.

5843. Chairman.] Have you considered what should be done with children of parents who are in a workhouse for a short time; not necessarily ins and outs, but in the workhouse, perhaps, for a month or two months?

That is a very great difficulty. And I would say also that the system of district schools encourages parents to come into the workhouse, and remain. We have now 30 children at the Ashford school, their parents being in the workhouse. Some of them have been there two or three years, and they are able-bodied persons. There is no way under the present law to turn them out; and that is one of the evils of the district school system, that it encourages idlers to come in and send their children to these what they call boarding schools; and it has been told me by the officials in the workhouse that they say, "We will stop another year, and give the children another year of the boarding school."

5844. Earl of Hopetown.] Do they teach the children absolutely nothing of common sense in the district schools?

I think not. There are a few children of the elder girls that are told off to help the cooks in the kitchen; but the cooking is done by steam and gas, and it is all done in a large way, and when they go into small houses where they have open fire places, and have to roast and boil in a small way, they cannot do it, because they have been accustomed to large steam boilers and covered grates, and that kind of thing, which is not at all instructive for them, in the ordinary sense.

5845. Do they teach them to make their own clothes and to sew?

When I first went to the district school they did make their own clothes, but they made them very badly. I reformed the school to some extent; but it may have got back now to what it was before. The fact is, officials are inclined to be a little bit lazy, and do the thing as easy as they can. There is no special motive, except the money motive; that is the great fault in these institutions for children.

5846. I suppose they know absolutely nothing of the outside world?

They know nothing at all of the outside world; their minds are entirely blank. I took one of those girls into my house to help the housemaid, and she treated my furniture as she would the wooden benches of the school, and used to scratch her name on the polished furniture, and did about 30 l. worth of damage in a fortnight.

5847. You mentioned that they were continually out of place; I suppose that was the result of utter ignorance of domestic work?

Yes. I would mention one thing with regard to the statistics given as to these girls by the Association for Befriending Young Servants. The statistics show sometimes that a great number of these girls turn out well, but some have only been six months at the school, and they are counted as belonging to the district schools. It would make a great difference if they had only been there for a short time. Statistics are valueless unless they are considered with discrimination.

5848. Earl of Strafford.] Do you think, then, that the kind of training and experience that girls get in cottage homes is more likely to be of use to them than the training they would get in the district and workhouse schools, that they would be able to know a little more of the domestic economy of life?

Yes; their faculties would be cultivated, and they would learn to grasp things; whereas, when they come away from those schools, they have no versatility of mind, and cannot grasp anything.

5849. They would have picked up things in domestic economy; matters relating to washing and cooking?

Yes.
Yes. With regard to the boys, I think they do better at the schools, because there are workshops; tailors' and so on.

5850. My question applied to the girls?
Yes; as to the girls it is so. May I say that the great stumbling block in the way of getting rid of these district schools is that they are built. I hope some Bill for technical education will be passed, and I would suggest that these places might be turned into places for technical instruction. I think that would be rather a good idea.

5851. Have you ever visited the large district schools, like Hanwell?
Yes, I have been to nearly all.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Reverend Benjamin Waugh, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5852. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have you had experience in connection with the prevention of cruelty to children?
Yes, I have had considerable experience, having had about 780 cases of cruelty to children through my hands during the last four years. I am the honorary secretary of the London Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and practically director of that society.

5853. I want to ask you some questions with reference only to cases of cruelty to children which were connected with the administration of the Poor Law in one way or another. I will ask you generally first, have you had a considerable number of such cases under your personal observation?
We have had a considerable number of cases connected with the administration of the Poor Law, but we have had very few cases indeed in which any charge of cruelty could be brought against any of the officers connected with its institutions.

5854. I am referring rather to cases where the children were, or might have been, looked after by any officials of the Poor Law?
We have had during that time 250 cases of starvation, which have all of them been neglected by the officials of the Poor Law in the districts in which they have occurred. Of that number, 25 cases died; we sent 35 people connected with them to prison for periods varying from one month to 15 years' penal servitude; and we have warned 235 cases by issuing a notice, a copy of which I have brought for your Lordships, calling attention to the Statute of Parliament which renders neglect to feed children criminal; and in relation to all these cases I may say that we keep them under supervision, and we have not had to prosecute in one single instance. Perhaps your Lordships would like to have a copy of the form issued (handing in the same). Substantially that has been issued in 235 cases, and in every case it has had the desired result more or less; in some partially, and in some very fully. I may say, too, that many of these cases have been sent to us by the workhouse authorities, either officially or unofficially, and that we have taken them up often in co-operation with them, sometimes without their co-operation, and as a result we have, as I have said, sent 35 men and women for various periods to prison.

5855. In connection with the workshops carried on as part of the workhouse system, have you had any case to take action with regard to neglect, and so forth?
We have had cause to inquire into proceedings in workshops connected with the workhouses, and our opinion is that they are far too little directly connected with any responsible authorities. I should like to see them all placed under the Factory Act. They are, many of them, practically factories, though they are only for the manufacture of goods to be consumed on the premises. An immense advantage would be derived by the children, in many of the provincial districts.
districts especially, if all workshops in connection with the workhouse authorities were placed under the Factory Act. That is an impression that has been gathered by the investigation of our cases.

5856. Have you had cases inquired into resulting in any penalty being inflicted?
In the workshops, do you mean? In no case. We have not considered that there has been any real cruelty, certainly, not deliberate cruelty; but we have, in some cases, had the impression that there was plenty of room for cruelty, which might have been prevented by a very little more care in administration.

5857. With regard to the cases of children being insufficiently fed, there is an order, is there not, giving discretionary power to the Poor Law officials to take cognisance of such cases?
There is an Act of Parliament, 31 & 32 Vict. c. 122, s. 37, which requires that every board of guardians shall (the word "shall" is used) institute prosecutions, and pay the costs where they have reason to believe that children are not sufficiently fed. But the practical effect of that is, first, that the guardians do not act upon it to any very great extent; secondly, that the police know that it is not their business, and they do not act upon it; and, thirdly, the public have an impression that they are excluded from taking cognisance of starvation cases, because the term used is, "the guardians shall" do it. My Society was challenged, when it first undertook to act on behalf of starving children, with the fact that the guardians being appointed to do that, and the Act saying that they shall do that, excluded any one else; and again and again magistrates declined to let us take action. But some magistrates took the opposite view, and now I think we have about 20 or 30 cases which we have conducted to a successful issue without being challenged, and practically the precedent has been set, and the custom is being altered.

5858. As a matter of fact, are there cases where the officers of the Poor Law, the guardians, are in the habit of taking action in this direction?
There are cases in which they are habitually doing it, chiefly where ladies are upon the board, but in a very small number of cases indeed throughout the country. We have a record at the office of all the cases that have come to our knowledge. Still it is a matter of fact that the returning officers know of cases of children starving to death, and take no action. On that point I may say that we have prepared a Bill to make it possible for "any person" to take proceedings, and to thus cast the responsibility upon the public as well as the guardians.

5859. Making it possible for any person to take proceedings who has reason to believe that the child is insufficiently fed?
Where any person has reason to believe that a child is insufficiently fed, that he can lay an information and take proceedings.

5860. Lord Belmore of Burley.] On that point you used the expression, "Children who were or might have been looked after by the officers of the Poor Law;" would you define that a little more?
I will take a case at Swindon. Last week we sent to prison two persons who had seven children in their custody, all of whom were looked after by the relieving officer to this extent. In January last he visited and reproved the woman, and I think he called the house very filthy some time in March, but no action was taken. The children were all dying; one child weighed 10 pounds that ought to have weighed 24, and one weighed 16 pounds that ought to have weighed 37; and we brought the woman before the assessors at Salisbury last week. The woman was sentenced for two years, and the husband for nine months, by Mr. Justice Day. All these children were dying; they were all assured on a total sum of about 42 l. The relieving officer of the guardians had known of this case, and they were being looked after in a sense; that is to say, the officer visited and warned the woman, and told the
the woman that he should have to take some steps, if she did not feed her children.

5861. They were getting out-door relief, I suppose?

No relief. The occasion of the visit in January was, that a medical officer had intimated that one of the children ought to have medical relief.

5862. The relieving officer was taking action under this 37th Section, was he?

No; he was not taking any action, except that he was sent by the medical officer to give some physic for the use of one of the children that had been brought to him by the woman.

5863. Then that person had applied for relief?

For medical relief in one case.

5864. Then in that case he was not proceeding under this 37th Section?

No; he was not taking any action with a view to prosecution; he was only responding to a request.

5865. I understand your point to be, that they were children who were, or who might have been looked after by the officers of the Poor Law; children who ought to have been looked after under that section?

Yes.

5866. I do not understand that any of the complaints you have to make are against any officers of the Poor Law in cases where children were under their charge on account of their parents receiving relief?

We have no complaints to make of that kind. We have somewhat serious ones on some points of administration which I may come to later in my evidence.

5867. Earl of Aberdeen. No doubt you could give us many descriptions of cruelty to children of a very harrowing kind; but what we require are simply matters of fact within your experience; we do not want any vague stories or rumours of cruelty or any mere humanitarian expressions; we want plain matters of fact based on your own personal knowledge and experience. Is that what you are prepared to give us?

I am prepared to give you 35 cases of the kind I call, generally, starvation cases, from my own experience, the details of which I have here.

5868. And also cases which, in some way or other, are connected with Poor Law administration?

Every case ought to have been dealt with by the Poor Law officials.

5869. With regard to the provisions of this Act you have quoted, do you find that it is well understood that such a power exists?

It is practically a dead letter.

5870. Is there an impression that the officials of the Poor Law are not entitled to interfere in cases of ill-fed or starving children, unless the parents and others who control the children are receiving out-door relief?

I should say, in relation to the law clerks of the boards of guardians, there is no such impression on their part; but in relation to the relieving officers, a large number of these we discovered to be in absolute ignorance of what the law is, and they clearly have never had the slightest training in the matter, have never had a copy of the Act of Parliament, nor any special clauses brought to their knowledge. As a rule, they are exceedingly ignorant of the power in their hands.

5871. Will you give any cases of starvation, or any approaching to starvation, of children, where the relieving officer might have interfered?

Recently I was staying at Northwich, when a visitor at the house I was staying at came in and mentioned that he had spoken to the relieving officer (70.)
and to some of the guardians about the case of a Samuel Thomson, a little boy who was in a most emaciated condition in a house where everybody else was well-fed, and everything else was very clean. He was a step-child, and the people who had the custody of him bore a good character for cleanliness and sobriety; and there seemed to be no power to interfere, and nobody would interfere. I myself went to the house, and next day instituted proceedings, and within a fortnight the woman was sent for six months to prison under the very Act by which the board of guardians were not only entitled, but by the specific wording of which they were commanded, to take proceedings. That one case is an illustration of a great many cases which we have found, in which this Act of Parliament is practically a dead letter.

5872. Chairman.] You spoke of the powers of the relieving officer; would the relieving officer have any special power; the power appears to be lodged in the board of guardians?

He would have to report, I suppose, to the guardians, and receive his instructions from them, but he is practically the eyes and the fingers with which they work. The board knows nothing of the condition of an out-door child except through the relieving officer.

5873. But would the relieving officer have any power to enter a house where no one was receiving relief?

I believe so. This Act of Parliament not only says that there is the power, but that the guardians shall exercise it, where they have reason to believe——

5874. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Where does it say that the relieving officer shall enter the house?

Not the relieving officer; he has no power to do anything.

5875. Chairman.] The power that you have pointed out appears to be lodged in the board of guardians, and the duty of the board of guardians, if a case comes to their knowledge, is to take proceedings?

Yes.

5876. But it seems as if the relieving officer had no special power; but, of course, he could report any case that came to his knowledge to the board of guardians?

My answer to that would be that in many cases the board of guardians is not aware of its power to interfere in such a case, and that the relieving officer is not aware that it is his duty to report such a case.

5877. Earl of Aberdeen.] The proper course would be, if he had reason to suspect any case of such a kind, to report it to the guardians?

Yes; it would be the board's law officer's duty to take the proceedings, and it would be his duty to advise on the case.

5878. Chairman.] Whom do you mean by the law officer?

I mean the clerk.

5879. He is not necessarily a solicitor?

The clerk of the board, whatever he is.

5880. The board of guardians might lay an information before the magistrates; but that they might do upon any information that reached them, whether through the relieving officer or in any other way?

Yes.

5881. And your complaint is that they are either ignorant of the law, or that if they do know it, they do not enforce it?

I should not like to say it is my complaint, but it is a fact. On the whole, they have worked with us so well in everything that we have done, that I should not like to make any complaints against them.

5882. Earl of Aberdeen.] In some of these cases of starvation or cruelty to children, had the parents been in very poor circumstances, or were they able to maintain their children properly?

Very
Very well able, mostly. There was one case of a man at Sheffield whose starving children were well known for some time. The father when taken into custody had deposit notes on him for 25 l. He was a great better; children were not in his way, and we sent him to seven years' penal servitude.

5883. What was the condition of the children?
One child was dead, and the other two were simply walking skeletons; they had been locked up in a house at Barnsley, which was in Chancery, and inhabited it for 18 months, and were known to the School officer, to the police, and to the relieving officer; and nobody took any action till one child was dead. In another case, in the case of a man at Ilkeston, three children had all been starved to death one after the other, and the man had received his insurance money, and everybody had said what a great shame it was. He had been dismissed from the inquest with, "You are a disgrace to humanity;" but nobody took any action in this matter until the London Society on the death of the third, sent him to prison, and his wife too. That man was in receipt of 3 l. a week, and had been so during the whole time, a period of five years, that he had been known to starve his children.

5884. Do you find a general impression in connection with your inquiries, on the part of the public and the neighbours in these cases, that a man may do as he likes with his children short of murdering them.
Not "short of murdering them," but he must not murder them so as to have a coroner's inquest. There are specified ways of murder which are illegal, but there are other ways which he may adopt, and which as a rule he does adopt. At this time we have several cases reported to us in which we are taking proceedings, and I think probably we shall save the lives of children. They are insured. They have been shut out of doors at night at intervals without the flannel underclothing which they had worn during the day, in order that they might contract some disease. The law is that in its last illness each child must be seen by a doctor. That is easily arranged; the doctor charges very little for the medicine; and for 2 s. 6 d. the owner of the child can secure his 10 l.

5885. As to any possible remedies, would you be in favour of further powers to the guardians as to the rules concerning the restoration of children to their parents after they have been in the workhouse?
In relation to cases in the workhouse, we have some small experience. We have two cases where children have been in the workhouse, abandoned by their parents, perhaps at the age of three or four, and the parents have been discovered when the children have got to 10 or 12 years of age. In one case the child wore an instrument and was practically a cripple, which instrument required adjustment every few weeks to the growth and condition of the child. The other was the case of a child who had used a crutch up to within a few weeks of the time at which her parents were discovered, and both these, by the order of the Local Government Board, were to be restored to their parents. We made inquiries as to the character of their parents. In relation to the crippled boy we found that they were rag-and-bone collectors. The crippled boy would be welcomed as likely to help them to get their living by appealing to charity. The girl had been suffering from a spinal affection and was allowed to sit up two hours a day by the doctor. By the order of the Board these children were to be returned to their parents who had no affection for them. In both cases they had married again; in one case the mother had died, and in the other the father. They were reported to us, and we considered that it was a cruelty which was to be practised; and we communicated with our informants. The guardians were very sorry, and very anxious to retain the children, but the imperative orders of the Local Government Board left them no discretion.

5886. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Could the Local Government Board help themselves?
They did help themselves. We appealed to the Local Government Board and the children were retained.

(70.)
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5887. Earl
5887. Earl of Aberdeen.] The order was suspended in relation to those two children, in fact?

Yes.

5888. Would you be in favour of issuing a supplemental order with regard to the powers of guardians to retain children in such cases?

I think that in cases of delicacy, in cases of cripples especially, where they were abandoned from want of natural affection and have been long abandoned, and in cases most especially where such parents have married again, it is an act of the greatest cruelty to restore children to them; and I should further say, as a matter of political economy, it is an absolute waste of money. I have nothing to do with the political economy, but it seems a strange thing to give back to parents children who will help them to excite charity, when you have provided for those children out of the rates from three to 10 or 11 years of age with the effect of fitting them for that purpose.

5889. How would you meet the objection which is often made to any proposal in that direction, the objection that if you refuse to entrust children to the care of vicious parents all the vicious parents will be very glad to get their children saddled upon the State.

I think that is a very substantial objection, and my recommendation would be that the guardians should put themselves directly in communication with my Society in the case of any abandoned child. We have imprisoned some for the abandoning of children, and if we could get the guardians to co-operate with us, we could do more; that is, if they abandoned the child at three years of age, they should be found and required when it was three years of age to properly behave themselves to it in their own house.

5890. Chairman.] Would it be possible to make some such a regulation as this: that where the children had been for any given period deserted, and had been for a long time under the control of the workhouse authorities, their parents having abandoned them, there should be a discretion lodged in the Local Government Board to prevent those children from being restored to their parents.

Yes, that would be a most valuable discretion, but it should be the guardians.

5891. Unless, of course, it were shown that the parents were fit persons to take care of them, you think that might be done?

Not only that it might be, but that it is most desirable.

5892. Earl of Aberdeen.] Could there be any system, do you think, of compelling such parents to contribute to the expense of the maintenance of their children?

My experience would justify me in saying yes, but perhaps I ought to give the grounds. We have dealt with 780 cases in my society, and we have prosecuted 118; but we have sent out to the remainder warnings like this (producing a paper), and in nine cases out of 10 the mere threat to punish, and the mere knowledge upon the part of the man that his little child belongs to 31 & 32 Vict., c. 122, is so effectual with them that their conduct is immediately changed; and, though we keep them under supervision after giving the notice for six months, we have only had to prosecute after a warning once, and that includes 225 cases of starvation.

5893. You think there has been practically a kind of premium upon the using of children for the purpose of begging, and so forth, owing to the usual practice of restoring children to their parents at the age of about 11?

I am not aware that that is the practice, about 11; but our opinion is (we have made some provision in our new Bill to prevent that, I hope) that where parents are utterly worthless, to restore children to them at any time is a crime against society; they are new means of applying to the charity of people who are passing by, and helps to adult idleness; and we think that the workhouse authorities ought to have power to refuse them to parents of a worthless character. The case ought to be certified before a magistrate, and the magistrate should give to the workhouse the right which is given at present to
to industrial schools, the right of custody up to the age of 16. That could be obtained by the extension of the provisions of the Industrial Schools Act to the workhouse system. Where the magistrate considered, say under Section 14, that its legal custodian was an improper guardian, the workhouse should have authority to keep the child.

5894. Have you any other alterations in the law to suggest with reference to the points that you have been speaking of?

There are two points that I thought I should like to refer to, which have not been mentioned in the course of the Inquiry; the first is that I think the board of guardians ought to be entirely relieved of the duty of taking legal proceedings, and that there ought to be an auxiliary to the workhouse system in every town of some kind to which all cases where the law has been broken could be referred. That, I think, would tend very much to the putting down of starvation. The workhouse authorities have generally too much to do to attend to these cases; they are so difficult to get up. That is one point. Another is that our opinion is that it would be well that the workhouse authorities should have power to appoint, as if the children were in Chancery, through ordinary courts, uncles and aunts who are still of good moral character, grandfathers and grandmothers, as the legal custodians of children, where they are willing to maintain them. Now out of 42 cases, we have sent to the workhouse, we have had 15 with most respectable grandfathers and grandmothers and uncles and aunts, willing to maintain them if they could be secured the custody. But they could not; there is no power to give them custody; so that at any moment the parent man might come into their house and drag the children away, though he be the most worthless and unsuitable of custodians. If the workhouse authorities could, when application was made to them from highly respectable people, give the custody of the child to them, if, instead of taking it into the custody of the State, they could give it to persons who are able and willing to accept it, I think that would be an improvement greatly in the interests of the children, and also a saving to the expenses of the ratepayers.

5895. When you spoke of auxiliary power, you meant an extension of the statutory powers of the guardians in that direction?

No; not to the guardians, but an extension to everybody; so that the statutory power of the guardians should not be limited to the guardians, but that any organization or person in the neighbourhood willing to take the case up should be at liberty so to do.

5896. Chairman.] But did I not understand you to say that the magistrates have held that prosecution might take place without the intervention of the guardians?

It has never been settled yet; it may be raised some day, and there may be a case settling precisely the reverse. As a matter of practice, it is become so; but a case has never been stated yet.

5897. You would desire that persons should be liable to a prosecution in the ordinary manner by anyone who lays an information?

Yes. We have had two cases of scalding to death of children in the bath in workhouses.

5898. Were they inquired into?

One was in Manchester, and the other in Scarborough. Both were inquired into, and we discovered that there were no regulations for the bathing of children, and that the paupers themselves were employed to do it, and that the water was supplied, scalding or cold, just as the boiler happened to be stoked. Both the children died.

5899. Did the Local Government Board take action?

After our inquiry, the Local Government Board issued a circular, I believe, giving directions for the future for the bathing of children.

(70.) 4 N 5900. Lord
5900. Lord Balfour of Burley.] These were cases rather of gross neglect than of absolute cruelty?

No cruelty; I have not one charge to make of cruelty.

5901. Chairman.] Would you desire that the powers should be taken away from the guardians which is now given to them by the clause you have referred to?

I should; I think a divided authority is a bad authority.

5902. What authority would you set up instead?

The police. In the case of an assault a policeman can interfere; assault and starvation often go together, and yet, in the one half of the case the policeman can act, in the other half he cannot, there is a divided responsibility.

5903. Would it not be better to give a power in the ordinary matter, by prosecution, to interfere if an offence is committed, but to leave also to the guardians the duty now imposed upon them; for this reason; that in many cases the guardians have better reason to know what is going on than any other person?

That is so.

5904. Earl of Aberdeen.] I believe you have a branch of your society in the two towns where the scalding cases took place, namely, Manchester and Scarborough?

Yes. I may say that it is where we have branches that we gain information. We do not know what the state of things is in places to which we have not yet gained access.

5905. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is not the power to pay the costs of the prosecution out of the rates rather an important element; would you take that power away?

The costs are so heavy. In a case of starvation, we have paid 38l. to get a conviction. I fear that the best way of doing it is to put it out of the hands of the guardians.

5906. I should have thought power to get costs or part of the costs out of the rates is an important auxiliary?

You can get it from the Treasury and county fund.

5907. I did not understand you to make any complaint against the conduct of the Local Government Board in ordering the restoration of the children, when required, to their parents?

On the general principle I make no complaint.

5908. The Board could not help themselves under the general regulation?

The general regulation, I believe, is made by the Board, and is subject to modifications; it is not an Act of Parliament regulation.

5909. Is not the right of the parent to the custody of the child a common law right?

Yes; but in the cases I referred to "right" does not arise. The children were being imposed upon the parent.

5910. By whom?

By the order of the Local Government Board.

5911. Who wished to keep them away from the parent?

The guardians.

5912. And how did it come to the cognisance of the Local Government Board?

I brought it to their knowledge; here is the correspondence (producing some papers).

5913. But who asked for the initiation of the authority of the Local Government Board?

I did;
I did; simply because the Local Government Board has always co-operated with my society from the first.

5914. I want clearly to understand it. If you appealed to the Local Government Board, you did not ask them to have the children restored?
I asked them to suspend the order, that the children might not be restored to their parents.

5915. And did the Local Government Board refuse that?
On the request of the guardians I believe that the Local Government Board did refuse, and at our request they consented.

5916. Did the guardians request the Local Government Board to refuse?
No; the guardians requested the Local Government Board to be allowed to retain the children, the order being that when the parents were found they must send the children to them. They had found the parents and were reluctantly about to carry out the order, with great reluctance on the part of the medical man, when the matter was reported to us as an act of cruelty.

5917. Did the Local Government Board know the whole circumstances when they made that order?
The order was not made as to those children; it is an order made for all children.

5918. But when the Local Government Board directed the carrying out of that order, had they all the special circumstances before them?
That I cannot say.

5919. As soon as they had the special circumstances before them they suspended the order.

5920. Earl of Aberdeen.] Had the guardians asked the Local Government Board to suspend the order before you made the application?
I believe so. I had no communications with the guardians as such; it may be through the guardians that the information came to my society. We took action to prevent a girl with spinal weakness and a crippled boy being restored to worthless people.

5921. Lord Balfour of Burley.] I suppose if the parents had wanted to get back the children they could have gone to law about it, and the guardians and yourself and the Local Government Board would have been obliged in the present state of the law to give back the children:
Yes.

5922. Therefore the Local Government Board, until they knew the circumstances, were only acting upon what is the common law of the land?
No; it is not the common law of the land to restore a child to a parent who has not asked for it. The industrial schools in the case of a child under 16 years of age do not restore it even when he does.

5923. Chairman.] I understand that the parents having been found, in the ordinary course the children ought to have been supported by them instead of being supported out of the rates?
Yes.

5924. The parents had not applied, and the guardians did not desire to give the children back: the Local Government Board interfered, and have authorised the guardians still to keep them?
Yes.

5925. Were the parents in a condition to support the children?
One of the parents is a rag and bone collector, who has married a second time.

5926. I did not mean to ask as to their moral character, but as to whether they had the means of supporting them?
I should think scarcely in one case, because a surgical apparatus had to be worn.

(70.)
5927. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Then I understand you to recommend that in the case of what you call worthless parents the State shall assume an authority to take away their children from them?
   I do not recommend that, but that it shall assume an authority which will compel them to behave reasonably to them in their own homes.

5928. But I understood you to recommend an extension of the procedure under the Industrial Schools Act to what you term worthless parents?
   Yes.

5929. How do you define the expression "worthless"?
   The magistrate has to define it in cases under the Industrial Schools Act.

5930. I do not think that is quite so?
   The word "worthless" is not used there.

5931. But there are certain definite circumstances which are mentioned such as the being found in a brothel?
   That is for girls.

5932. Or some clearly defined circumstance of that kind?
   The words are these: first, being found wandering without any visible means of subsistence; another is, frequenting the company of reputed thieves; another is, that they shall be in improper guardianship. We do not enforce the Industrial Schools Act, I may say; we only deal with the criminal law.

5933. Can you point out the words to which you refer? You referred just now to the improper conduct of people from whom children might be taken (handing the Act of Parliament to the Witness)?
   Sub-section 2 of Section 14 of the Industrial Schools Act, 1886, refers to a child "that is found wandering and not having any home or settled place of abode, or" (this is "or" not "and") "proper guardianship or visible means of subsistence." If the guardians could enforce those clauses, they could take the custody of any child as Industrial Schools already takes.

5934. Do not you see that the point is that the child must be found wandering, not having any home, or not having any proper guardianship, or not having any visible means of subsistence; the condition precedent is that the child must be found wandering?
   That is so.

5935. Now, I understand you to propose to extend it to taking away a child from any parents whom you describe as worthless?
   I propose to extend it so as to take, where there is no proper guardianship, all the children who are abandoned. Nearly 7,000 last year would have belonged to the workhouse authorities till they were 16 years of age if you had the same right as you have when you send them to the industrial schools.

5936. What do you mean by proper guardianship?
   That the magistrate must settle. If a man has abandoned his family and gone to Scotland, and if his children at home, we consider that this at least is improper guardianship.

5937. Is not that leaving a much wider discretion to the State than is left in any existing Act?
   It would not leave any larger discretion to Courts than they already exercise. There have been sent about 15,000 children to industrial schools in London under that clause. If those 15,000 had gone to workhouses they could have been claimed the next day. As it was, they were being made decent citizens being kept from guardianship which the Court considered improper.

5938. I understand this: that you want to make it a condition, and the only condition, for taking away the children, that the parent shall be worthless, whether
whether he is wandering, or leaving out of consideration the wandering or
vagrancy; is that so?
No, that is not correct.

5939. Will you state exactly what you want?
My first thing is to discover the parent who abandons his child, send him to
the treadmill for six months, meanwhile take care of his child.

5940. I did not understand that the abandonment was to come into the
question; I understood you to recommend that the State should enter in
and take away the children when the guardians think the parents worth-
less?
Where the parent is likely to bring up the child at all decently, neither an
industrial school officer nor a relieving officer ought to interfere; but where the
relieving officer does not interfere and the industrial school officer does,
I say that the law ought to be made equal; that the powers of
the industrial school officer ought to be in the hands of the relieving officer for
similar purposes under similar conditions.

5941. Chairman.] Will you allow me to state this case; I will suppose that
there are parents, both of whom are drunken; they do not abandon their
children, but they are known to be persons of indifferent character and they
have children; are you of opinion that the law should enable those children to
be taken away from those parents on the ground of their bad moral character,
without reference to whether they were wandering about or not?
No, I do not think so; but they ought to have a notice of what the law is as to
their negligence of their children. We have made many parents more
sober by threatening to prosecute.

5942. Lord Balfour of Burley.] What do you want the Poor Law authorities
to do which they have not done for you under the law as it now stands?
Not for us, but for children. I think the Poor Law authorities ought to
enforce the Statute as to the feeding of children.

5943. What Statute do you refer to?
I refer to the 31st & 32nd Vict. c. 122, s. 37.

5944. But anything else?
No other.

5945. In fact you find that the Poor Law authorities do co-operate with you
to the best of their ability?
Always, I think, with few exceptions in the whole country.

5946. You have no specific charges of cruelty to bring against those who are
now engaged in the administration of the Poor Law?
Not one. I may add, perhaps, that in their schools there are cruelties which
arise from traditional ideas about chastisement of children as in other schools;
but no special cruelties in the workhouse schools.

5947. Chairman.] Would you explain what you mean by excessive chastise-
ment?
I mean by excessive chastisement, giving a boy on his bare buttocks 25
strokes, turning them into a mass of pulp. That I consider to be barbarous;
better is common in schools that it is not regarded as illegal by many magis-
trates.

5948. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You have no charge to make that this
castigation is more severe in workhouse schools than in the ordinary run of
schools which are not workhouse schools?
I think it is even less severe than in industrial schools and reformatories.

5949. But I ask with regard to ordinary schools?
In ordinary schools and workhouse schools it is normal; it is alike in them
both.

(70.)

5950. Earl
5950. Earl of Aberdeen.] Would you suggest that the workhouse schools, being under State management, there is a special responsibility in the matter? I think a very serious responsibility.

5951. Chairman.] You mentioned the extension of the Factory Act as desirable in regard to workshops; is that on account of the hours being too long, or what is the point exactly? The condition of the workshops are very various. This is a matter of administration in which there is no rule.

5952. But what are the points on which you think there are now abuses which would be remedied by bringing them under the Factory Act? They have scarcely come under my Society's cognisance, but under my personal cognisance: first, as to inadequate room for the workers; and, secondly, irregular hours and sometimes too prolonged; but not on any ground which might be technically called "cruelty."

5953. Earl Spencer.] With regard to these workshops, are they workshops exclusively for the children in the workhouses? Exclusively.

5954. In workhouses where they do not send their children to district schools? Our contact with the workhouses is very slight. We have occasional access to them because they often take the custody of children pending trials, and the like. A demand of three weeks sometimes will take place, and the child is in the workhouse but virtually in our custody. And we have to get evidence from the child of the charge which has to be preferred, and we therefore have to visit workhouses. We have access, therefore, to the children wherever they happen to be, whether they are about to be bathed, or in the workshop, or in their bedrooms. My Society, I must say, has no responsibility for these remarks; but the impression produced on me is that great advantages would arise in the workshops if it was conformed a little more to the conditions of the Factory Act.

5955. What do they do in these workshops? They make shoes, &c., to be used on the premises; they are not for the market as I understand; that I am not quite clear about; it has not been my business to inquire.

5956. Are they mixed up there with the older paupers in the workhouse? In some cases; there is very great irregularity. It is irregularity, and inadequate room, I think, which are the two grounds on which a recommendation could be made.

5957. What sort of irregularity? It would be irregularity as to hours. I think there is the same rule applied to working as to bathing, as I recently mentioned, where everything was done by rule of thumb.

5958. Do they keep children too many hours a day in the workshop? I should think the hours very much more convenient sometimes to the master than to the children.

5959. And not under proper supervision? I am speaking now from a cursory view, and I wish it to be understood that I could prove nothing; but I give impressions. My impression is that the workshops are not under very close supervision, nothing like so close a supervision as the places where the rule of three is taught; there they are under Government supervision, of course, as well as in the workhouse; but the schools of the workhouse and the workshops do not compare well.

5960. Lord Thring.] With respect to the starvation of children, you are aware that it is a common law offence, but I understand you that it being an indicable
indictable offence you wish to avoid the expense of indictment by having it placed under summary jurisdiction?

Yes, that is the change I desire. Anyone can at present prosecute under the common law.

5961. If you make it an offence in legal language, tryable by summary jurisdiction, that would affect what you want?

Yes.

5962. Then when you use the term "worthless parents," you consider that your object would be practically carried into effect by enactment that every child found wandering and not under proper guardianship might be sent by the relieving officer to a district school instead of to an industrial or reformatory school?

Precisely so. I might add not only found wandering, but in other words that all the provisions of the Industrial Schools Act shall apply for the purpose of the guardians.

5963. In other words that the relieving officer should have the power, when that provision of the Industrial Schools Act was violated, to get them sent by order of a magistrate to a district school or home, or to these cottage homes, or other places for children under the supervision of the guardians, instead of having them sent to an industrial or reformatory school?

That is exactly the point.

5964. Earl of Hopetoun.] You mentioned that a good many cases had come under your knowledge of children being starved to death, or otherwise illtreated to death, in order to get the insurance money?

Yes.

5965. Do you look upon the insurances as practically a premium upon murder?

Yes. I think they are simply ruining the country; they are creating a new kind of gambling; and the child is the thing with which people gamble.

5966. Have you thought of any plan to put a stop to an evil of that kind?

We have proposed, in order to make insurance of children really an insurance of their living, not of their dying, that any person under-feeding or assaulting an insured child shall be liable to a double penalty; that whereas under summary jurisdiction he can have six months' imprisonment, in the event of any neglect proved to be culpable, in the case of a child insured, the magistrate shall be able to add another six months' imprisonment, and thus give 12 months under summary jurisdiction.

5967. Take the case of a person who commits an assault upon a child, not knowing that the child is insured; how would that person be affected by such an enactment?

Then the person committing the assault would not be liable; the person must have a beneficiary interest; it must be a person who is interested in the death who commits the assault; any schoolmaster doing it would not be liable.

5968. Has this Act, you speak of, been before the House of Commons?

The Bill is in the hands of Mr. Mundella; it is not yet before the House.

5969. Earl of Strafford.] In your article in the "Contemporary Review" of last month, you allude to a Bill which is being prepared for the better protection of children, and the severer punishment of those who illtreat children; has it been introduced in the House of Commons?

It is now in the hands of Mr. Mundella and Mr. Reid, and has not been introduced.

5970. Then I am afraid it will not be introduced, considering the late period of the Session now?

We shall be greatly grieved if we cannot do something this winter. I believe a thousand children are murdered every winter in this London of ours.

(70.)
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5971. Earl
5971. Earl of Aberdeen.] With regard to what you propose, as to extending the powers of guardians, in the direction of keeping children from vicious parents, do you consider that the discretion which would be vested in the magistrates would not be greater than practically they have to exercise now, in regard to industrial schools?

Not in the least; it would be an identical. The destination of the child would be changed from the industrial school to the workhouse; that is all.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

The Honourable Sydney Holland, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5972. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You are a guardian of St. George's, Hanover-square?

Yes.

5973. And you wish to hand in some returns showing the course of admissions and discharges of some of the most notorious of that class of paupers whom we know as in-and-outers?

Yes. I have only taken those that have children, because we consider that it is so very detrimental to the interests of the children that these people should go in and out, taking their children with them, and preventing us from sending them to the district schools or giving them any proper education. I should like also to hand in some figures showing the length of time which these people stop in and the time which they stop out, in three rather flagrant instances. (The Returns are handed in. See Appendix.)

The Witness is directed to withdraw.

Mr. Francis C. Ball, having been called in; is Examined, as follows:

5974. Chairman.] You are chairman of the Wandsworth Board of Guardians?

Yes.

5975. And you desire to give some evidence with regard to the practice of your board especially as to giving out-door relief?

Yes.

5976. We have had evidence from one member of your board, Mr. Acworth, from which we gathered that the majority of the board are in favour of giving out-door relief to some considerable extent?

Yes.

5977. Would you tell us what your experience is in that respect?

In what particular kind of case do you mean?

5978. I should be glad if you would tell me generally whether your practice is to give in-door relief or out-door relief?

I should think that on the whole the opinion at least of the majority of the board (I am trying to speak for the majority, not my individual views) is that it is desirable, as a rule, to give out-door relief in preference to in-door relief, that is to say, when we have to deal with respectable people.

5979. And upon what principle is that based?
It is very difficult to define it, because you have to take each individual case on its own merits entirely, in the administration of the Poor Law.

5980. You are aware that in certain unions in London a strict administration of in-door relief and an avoidance of giving out-door relief has very largely reduced pauperism; is your board of opinion that that would not be applicable to Wandsworth?

We do not think it would at the present moment; I think probably your Lordship is comparing Whitechapel with our union?

5981. Whitechapel, St. George's-in-the-East, and Stepney are the three most remarkable instances that have been given to us?

I think as to Whitechapel it is hardly fair perhaps to compare it with our union, because they have so much extraneous help. I do not think at the ordinary board of guardians a Jew ever comes forward for relief, and there are a very great number of Jews in Whitechapel; their own guardians relieve them; then, further, they have a valuable charity organisation committee which works with the guardians. Now, we have neither of these to fall back upon for Wandsworth and Clapham.

5982. That remark as to the Jews only applies to Whitechapel, and would not be the case with St. George's-in-the-East or Stepney?

No.

5983. Are you of opinion that the absence of such charity organisation in your case renders the out-door relief more necessary?

I think so. In Clapham, Streatham, Tooting, and Putney there is practically no charity organisation committee at all; there is a good one in Battersea. I think generally (perhaps you might allow me to say), that our view is, that if a family is thoroughly respectable and they are reduced to apply for relief, not owing to any fault of their own, such as intemperance or what not, they ought to be supported outside and the home ought not to be broken up. If they are disreputable, drunken, or immoral, we offer them the house.

5984. You are not of opinion that the giving of out-door relief to persons whom you describe as respectable tends to encourage people not to exert themselves and tends to cause a great deal of poverty which might otherwise be avoided?

I think it is quite possible that many of our people get more relief than they ought to have. I think perhaps it might not be amiss to mention, that some of our board, unfortunately are landlords of small houses, and they certainly would be in favour of out-relief; there is no question about it at all. There is a great deal of influence of that kind used.

5985. In one respect therefore you are assisting from the rates to pay the rent?

I think your Lordship must not take that as the opinion of the majority of the board.

5986. But I should like to know your own opinion, whether you think that is so?

In my opinion certainly I think it is the fact that in some cases persons are assisted really to enable them to pay their rent.

5987. Do you think that giving out-door relief tends to lower wages?

No, I think not, because we do not relieve able-bodied people out of doors with out-door relief; unless you mean the stoneyard.

5988. Is it the practice of your board, where old or infirm people can earn something, to supplement their earnings by a small dole, as it is called, from the rates?

To a very large extent.

5989. Will not the result of that necessarily be to enable these persons to work at lower wages than those who have not such assistance?
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Well,
Well, it is hardly a question of wages in the broad sense, because most of these people are women who get perhaps one day's charring a week, or something of that sort, getting 1s. 6d. or 2s., and I do not think that has any effect in reducing the wages of the mass generally.

5991. Would it not reduce the wages of that class of persons; would not the result be that, because these persons are receiving assistance from the rates and therefore can afford to take less wages than others?

It might in some cases be so, but our idea is, that if persons can with what they ordinarily receive from us, keep themselves decently outside, and if they are thoroughly respectable people, as far as we can ascertain, it is a very inhuman thing to send them into the house to herd with all the disreputable people we have unfortunately, got there.

5992. You do not think that there are a considerable number of persons now receiving relief who, if they were offered the house, would not come on the rates at all?

Very few, I should think.

5993. Does it often occur, in your opinion, that you offer the house to applicants and that the offer is declined?

Very often, by the disreputable class; I should think almost as a rule, you might say.

5994. Whether they are disreputable or reputable, would not the offer be often declined?

I think very often, thereby proving that we should not be justified in giving them out-relief.

5995. But the object of my question is to know whether there would not be a great many persons who are now receiving assistance from the rates in your union, who if they were offered the house would not accept the offer?

A great many.

5996. Is not the result, therefore, of your out-door relief to pauperise a great many persons who otherwise would not be paupers?

I think individually it might be so. Then comes in again the question of the majority.

5997. How do you deal with widows and their children?

First of all, we have to ascertain whether or not they have relations who can help them; if not, say a poor widow has three children, we suggest two going to the district schools, particularly if the home is not a very desirable one; otherwise we give her 1s. 6d. a head for the children outside, supposing the mother is able to supplement that by work.

5998. You did open a labour yard?

Yes; we spent 700l. on it for the half-year ending Lady Day last. I may say that as a rule I do not think one man in 10 of those ever did an honest day's work in his life, and many of us think that the proper course would have been to offer them the house, not to open the stoneyard. They did not do any real work. The supposed test was 8 cwt. a day, and they did about 3 cwt. on an average; and you cannot force them to do it.

5999. Then would you agree with the answer that Mr. Aecworth gave to the question, "Do you approve of the labour yard?" "It has done an immense deal of harm, I think, in our union?"

I think that in the rather broadcast way that it was done by us, it did some harm.

5999. Lord Balfour of Burley.] And that the harm would outweigh the benefit?

I can hardly go as far as that.

6000. What benefit did it confer?

It kept a lot of people from starving.
6001. But could you not have kept them from starving by offering the house?
But many of these people were people with large families, and then comes the question whether you are justified in breaking up their home.

6002. By the time they came to you had they any home worth much consideration?
I should think a considerable proportion.

6003. Would you have approved of the policy which is known as the Whitechapel order system; you know that?
I hardly could say I should approve of it as a whole. Do you not think we always must fall back upon this, that you must take every case on its own merits? I do not think we can make any general rule.

6004. Do you take the cases on their own merits in the stoneyard?
We endeavour to. If a man is thoroughly disreputable we offer him the house, not the stoneyard.

6005. But I thought you said that so few of the people in the stoneyard had ever done an honest day's work?
And the result of our offering the house is that a great many will not come in at all.

6006. But still you spent 700 l. in a half year on those who never did an honest day's work?
That is the opinion of some of the board; I could not say it is exactly my own opinion. I am in a very anomalous position here, because I am sent up to give the opinion of the majority, not my own. My own is, that nearly half the men in the stoneyard should not have been employed.

6007. Then I must again ask, what is the benefit which the stoneyard has conferred?
By benefiting the few at the expense of the ratepayers.

6008. Chairman. But did you not benefit the few by creating a great deal of pauperism in your union which would not otherwise have existed?
I am not in a position to answer in the affirmative as to that.

6009. Do you think that the men employed in the labour yard would have accepted the offer of the house?
No.

6010. Would not every man who accepted relief in the stoneyard who would not have accepted relief in the house be made a pauper by the stoneyard?
For the time being, certainly; but a number of respectable men got work after a time, which could not have been got in the winter.

6011. Either these men would have accepted the offer of the house or not; if they would not, they certainly would not have become paupers, if they had had no labour yard to go to.
I think they were not made permanent paupers, but for the time being.

6012. A temporary pauper, I suppose, is a pauper, is he not?
Yes, for the time being.

6013. We do not limit our definition of pauper to those who are permanent paupers. I rather was regarding your system as one which creates pauperism in your union which might have been avoided. Do not you think that any benefit which might have been obtained by helping a few respectable men is far outweighed by the demoralizing effects of your proceedings as regards a good many more?
I think perhaps we were too easy with some of them, giving people work to whom we had better not have given it.

6014. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Is not that always the result of an endeavour to take a very large number of cases upon the rates without the most careful and continuous scrutiny?
You must be landed in that difficulty, because the board of guardians cannot spend their time in hunting up each individual case.

6015. Chairman.] If you were prohibited by an order from opening a labour yard would you have any difficulty in dealing with the poverty in your union? I think we should have to give out-relief.

6016. To able-bodied men? I think so.

6017. But supposing you had no additional powers to give relief to able-bodied men, and that you were prohibited from having a labour yard, would you have any difficulty in dealing with the poverty in your district? I suppose not, because we should have to offer them the house.

6018. I mean whether your workhouse accommodation would be sufficient? At the present moment it would be sufficient certainly, because we have room for nearly 250 more in the house itself.

6019. Would you like to make any statement to us on other points? No.

6020. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You used the expressions "people who are reduced by no fault of their own," and "people who are thoroughly respectable," as describing those to whom you think you ought to give out-door relief?

Yes.

6021. Are you in a position to say that there are none upon your out-door relief roll who would not come under one or other of those definitions? I think the majority of cases on our list of out-relief are widows, old men; and children, if you call the schools out-relief; as of course in a sense, they are.

6022. Would you say of all of them that they were reduced by no fault of their own, and that they are thoroughly respectable? I think so as to the out majority of those outside the house. I could not say so of those in the house. I think it is quite the other way in their case.

6023. Does the attempt to draw a distinction between those who in your opinion are thoroughly respectable and are reduced by no fault of their own, and those who are not thoroughly respectable, give rise to any feeling and make the task of your relieving officers a more difficult one? It does; that is the difficulty, to define who are respectable persons and who are not.

6024. Is much pressure and influence in the way of canvassing brought to bear upon the individual members of the board in consequence of the knowledge that the decision in that way depends upon the judgment of individuals? I think there is a danger of that, for the reason I expressed to his Lordship just now; I think often the wiser judgment of some is overruled by the desire to help people outside who are tenants of others.

6025. And the constant pressure in that way is leading you to be laxer and laxer? I think that there my friend Mr. Aecworth was wrong, because he led your Lordships to believe that our out-relief increased out of all proportion to the population.

6026. He said he could not state that, because the population was increasing and shifting so much that he could not get any definite information by figures; but I want to know what your opinion is, whether you do not find it increasingly difficult to keep up to what you think the proper standard of respectability for out-door relief? I think it is from the impossibility often of getting at the truth.

6027. Do you think that there is a greater tendency to out-door relief on your board? I am afraid so; especially since last April, the last election.

6028. Lord
6028. Lord Sandhurst.] Did I understand you to say that there was no district office of the Charity Organization Society at Wandsworth?

I am speaking of Clapham, Wandsworth, and Putney and Streatham, where, as far as I have ascertained, very little is done by the Charity Organization Society. Of course they have officers, committee, and chairman, and so forth.

6029. And therefore, as they do so little, you are under a great disadvantage?

I think so. Take Clapham, for instance; there happens to be not a very powerful committee there, and certainly there is private charity enough there to help anybody without coming upon the rates at all, if it was organised; but it is completely disorganised.

6030. That is to say that the committee there is rather slack; if they had an organised charity it would be a great assistance to you, I understand you to say?

I think a strong organisation committee would relieve the rates in that particular parish (Clapham). I am not speaking of the entire union.

6031. Earl Spencer.] Is there a difference between the amount of out-door relief in Battersea parish and the rest of the union, in consequence of there being a Charity Organization Society in Battersea parish?

I think as a rule more relief is given by the Guardians in Battersea than in any of the other six parishes belonging to the union.

6032. Notwithstanding the fact that there is charity organization in Battersea.

But you must bear in mind that Battersea is an extremely poor parish; there are very few people in it who are able to help those about them.

6033. Lord Thring.] Would you agree with what several of the witnesses have told us, that a more organised system of charity would enable you in a great measure to dispense with out-door relief?

I think in our particular parish of Clapham it would; but I cannot say for the other six. In Battersea, for instance, there are very few rich residents, and therefore there is not much charity there, to administer.

6034. But supposing there was charity, would not the principle apply to your parish as well as to the east end of London?

I think Clapham has a larger amount of well-to-do people than any parish of the East of London.

6035. But the East-end is subsidised from without. Supposing you could have a well organised system of charity through the Charity Organization Society or any other society, would not that enable you, in your opinion, to dispense with this system of out-door relief, without really creating any hardship?

With a very large proportion of it. I think perhaps it would not be out of place for me to say that that is not a mere supposition. I happen to be treasurer of the Parish District Visitors Fund, and I see that the tendency is for the people whom we relieve, as guardians, to get relief in that way in addition.

6036. Whereas it ought to be another body?

Another body altogether.

6037. Charity and Poor Law ought to be mutually supplemental to each other, not competing?

Quite so.

6038. Earl of Strafford.] Do you approve of public works being undertaken in times of exceptional distress?

I think that anything is better than the stoneyard. Last winter before the Committee in which I was presiding, on one day, we had a watchmaker out of work, (70.)
a very respectable fellow, a picture-frame maker, and a carver. We had to
shunt those three poor fellows into the stoneyard, ruining their hands for their
work; and those were only a few isolated cases; that is the great difficulty we
have to contend with in the stoneyard, putting all these men to the same work.

6039. Unless the Guardians have an unlimited number of watches to
mend in times of distress, how can you help that?
I was alluding to the cruelty of putting a man engaged in a handicraft to
breaking stones.

6040. Can you devise anything as a remedy for that?
I think we want to have more latitude as to the employment we give them.

6041. What employment would you give them?
Husbandry would not injure a man's hand so much.

6042. Can you give men digging in London?
The question is whether we should not arrange to have land to employ these
people. We had men who were entirely incapacitated for work, from the way
their hands were knocked about by breaking stones.

6043. Earl of Aberdeen.] Would the same objection apply to the picking of
oakum?
I think so; except in the case of casuals, we do not have any oakum picked
at all, but cocoa-nut fibre; that does not injure the fingers.

6044. Chairman.] You are speaking of artizans?
Yes.

6045. In any agricultural labour they would have the same sort of difficulty as
you have been pointing out?
Not like breaking stones.

6046. We were told by Mr. Acworth that the amount of work that came
before your board was so much that you were not able to give more than perhaps
a minute to each case, and I understood from his answer that your board
consisted of 26 guardians?
Yes.

6047. Has it ever appeared to you that your union is too large for such a
board as you have, your union consisting of no less than 210,000 people at
the last census, and it being, I believe, a largely-increasing population; would
not the breaking up of your union into two or three lead to a far better and
more efficient administration?
I daresay it would. I do not admit that the statement is quite correct that
each case on an average takes only a minute; all I should say is, that I think
very often we do it too quickly. I am sure Mr. Acworth meant to be
accurate.

6048. But really the number of cases that come before you must be so large,
and the area of your union is so very large, that it is almost impossible, is it not,
that 26 persons can give the amount of time necessary to deal with them
adequately?
Perhaps I should inform you that the board is always divided into three
relief committees; otherwise we could not get through it at all.

6049. But even then that leaves a small number of guardians to deal with all
the cases, even if they are regular in their attendance?
As your Lordship has alluded to that, that is one very unfortunate feature in
our board, that so many guardians do not come to the relief committees, and
that is the most important work we have to do.

6050. Still, it is not fair to give guardians more work than they can do, and
then complain that they do not do it efficiently?
No doubt the union is too large now; it has a population of 250,000 at least.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
Mr. HENRY JOSEPH HAGGER is called in; and Examined, as follows:

6051. Lord Balfour of Burley.] You are, as I understand, the vestry clerk and clerk to the guardians of Liverpool?

Yes.

6052. And the Mr. Hagger to whom Mr. Herbert Mills alluded in his answer to Question 2389, which evidence, along with other evidence bearing upon Liverpool given by Mr. Mills, you have had an opportunity of seeing?

That is so.

6053. Have you any statement which you wish to make in regard to the evidence given by Mr. Mills on the casual ward?

That evidence comes in the answer to Questions 2203 and forwards. The general impression created by that evidence would be, I think, somewhat misleading; the shadows are put in much too blackly. For instance, in answer to Question 2204 he stated: "When I was admitted to the casual ward at Liverpool, it would be a quarter to six in the evening, and there were 26 men who sat there picking oakum; it was a very small room, not more than five feet wide I should say, a long narrow room; it was about the width of an ordinary railway carriage; the men had just room to sit opposite each other." Then in the next answer he says, "there were 13 men down each side." He goes on, at No. 2206: "There was room enough for them to sit; they sat opposite to each other. I believe there were no windows in the place, and only an iron grid at the far end of the room which let light and air into the place; there was a great iron door to the room, and the tramp-master told me that the men had been there from half-past six in the morning (it was then a quarter to six at night), and they had not finished their work. The man who sat nearest to us on the left hand held up his fingers; they were bleeding at the tips; he asked what was to be done with the oakum as it was not half picked, and this was the state it left his fingers in."

6054. And in answer to a further question, No. 2389, Mr. Mills goes on to say, "I spoke to Mr. Hagger, who is the vestry clerk there. He did not actually go with me into the ward, but he sent one of the men with me into the ward, and we talked about it afterwards, and he said, 'Well, you know the theory of the workhouse is that it is a place that is made intentionally uncomfortable for the poor; that we do not intend this place to be a place that will be attractive to the poor people'; that was the only remark he made about it when I pointed out these things," and so on. Did Mr. Mills tell you that he had seen the man's fingers bleeding from the picking of the oakum?

To that I can give a distinct negative answer. I am perfectly sure that no such complaint was ever made to me personally. I would just simply point out that it is not quite clear when he says, "we talked about it," whether he means that he spoke of it to me or to the man who, he says, was sent with him; because afterwards he goes on to speak of the same person having taken him to the bakehouse. That I did not do. I had conversation with Mr. Mills in my own office. But I did not go with him to the workhouse bakery.

6055. Now is the individual alluded to as the tramp-master still in your employment?

He is dead. With reference to the tramp ward itself, I think it is only right to state that the description of that is not at all accurate. I have a plan of the arrangement here. I do not at all wish your Lordships to suppose that we consider it a model workhouse. The place in which these men were working at the time was built and designed for a different class of work altogether; it was for corn grinding by handmills, and it was specially constructed with a view to allow of that being done (describing it to the Committee on a plan). The passages, two of 56 feet in length and one of 24 feet in length, the narrowest
narrowest of which is 7 feet 4 inches wide and the widest 8 feet 5 inches, were occasionally used when corn grinding was not in operation as oakum-picking rooms. I do not know that it makes very much difference what the material of the door is, but there is no iron door in the place.

6036. Chairman.] What number of men would there be at once in the ward?
On the day that Mr. Mills stated he visited it he said there were 26. These passages are 11 feet 3 inches high.

6037. Lord Balfour of Burley.] Have you ever had occasion to complain yourselves as guardians, or were any complaints ever made to you of the individual who is mentioned as the tramp-master and who, you say, is now dead.
Certainly not as exercising undue severity. My impression of him is, that if any complaint could fairly be brought against him it would be that he was rather too easy and lax in his management of the department.

6038. Has anyone who ever visited the workhouse or casual wards made any complaint of him to you of undue severity?
I believe not; I remember nothing of the kind ever having occurred.

6039. Were you clerk to the guardians at the time mentioned?
I have been so for the last 28 years.

6040. And would you know if any such complaint had been made?
A serious one I should have remembered. A trivial one I might not have remembered with the staff we have.

6041. Do you wish to make any other remark as to the evidence as regards Liverpool: perhaps there is one point you wish to speak of as regards there being no classification between the tramp and the respectable man?
We have no classification in the sense that we put the two classes into separate departments; but directions are given to the superintendent of the ward as far as he can to classify the men in his treatment of them. For instance, on the 4th of January 1883 this resolution was passed by the committee of management of the workhouse, as an instruction to the tramp-master:
"That in the case of such casual poor as may reasonably be considered to be bona fide seekers of work, they be detained for one night only, and be allowed to take advantage of the resolution passed at the last meeting, giving them the option of doing their task of work immediately on admission." That resolution was that if a man stated he wished to be discharged early the next morning to seek work he was to be allowed to do a reduced task the night before.

6042. I suppose you would go this length, would you not, that classification in theory is extremely desirable; but a thorough classification in practice is almost impracticable owing to the short time for which the person stays with you?
It is impracticable. A man comes, nothing is known of his antecedent history; he says he wants a night's lodging. How is one to say off-hand whether that man is a mere tramp or an honest seeker for work?

6043. That is one of the inherent disadvantages of the system of casual wards?
I suppose yes would be the proper answer to that. We must have some place for these people at night.

6044. Chairman.] Is it not perhaps rather the fact that it is inherent in the position of the people who want a night's lodging?
Probably that would be the fairer and better way of putting it.

6045. Earl of Aberdeen.] Have you ever been inside this casual ward before this inquiry?
Frequently.

6046. Mr. Mills was not incorrect in describing it as narrow?
It is a passage erected for another purpose, but whether it is his defective recollection
recollection or whether he went on a very dull day and everything had a gloomy aspect, I do not know. There is one point I should like to mention, because this evidence is misleading. I think it would appear that those men are confined to this particular place. The fact is, that they have the whole range of the department; they are not locked in, except in a somewhat extensive department; they can go into the yard when they like. The hours that Mr. Mills speaks of are the hours for the working; but they are not told that they must sit in that one place for 12 hours. They begin at six in the morning, and a man can stand up and stretch his legs and take a walk into the yard when he likes; the working hours would close at six o'clock at night, but a man would say naturally, "We opened at half past six this morning, and have been here ever since." It is not an imprisonment.

6667. Is the same place used now, or have you a larger place?
No, it is the same place. It is open to inspection by anyone who feels an interest in it.

The Witness is directed to withdraw.
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Appendix A.

PAPER handed in by Mr. Hentey, 23 April 1888.

TOWNSHIP OF MANCHESTER.

Regulations for the Administration of Relief, as adopted by the Board of Guardians, 15th April 1875, and Amended on the 23rd December 1875 and 3rd July 1879.

1. The Standing Orders which may from time be adopted by the Guardians for regulating the administration of relief, shall be strictly observed by the relief committees; but if, owing to the special circumstances of any particular case, the Relief Committee shall be of opinion that a departure from the Standing Order applicable thereto is advisable, such case shall be reported by the assistant clerk for the decision of the General Board, and in the meantime the Relief Committee shall make such provisional order in the case as to them shall seem necessary.

2. That the following be made and constituted

Standing Orders.

1. Out-door relief shall not be granted or allowed by the relief committees (except in case of sickness) to applicants of any of the following classes:

(a.) Single able-bodied men.
(b.) Single able-bodied women.
(c.) Able-bodied persons without children, or having only one child to support.
(d.) Married women (with or without families) whose husbands, having been convicted of crime, are undergoing a term of imprisonment.
(e.) Married women (with or without families) deserted by their husbands.
(f.) Married women (with or without families) left destitute through their husbands having joined the Militia, and being called up for training.
(g.) Persons residing with relatives, where the united income of the family is sufficient for the support of all its members, whether such relatives are liable by law to support the applicant or not.

II. Out-door relief shall not be granted, except in urgent or special cases, to persons whose destitution has been caused by intemperance or their own improvidence.

III. Out-door relief shall not be granted in any case for a longer period than eight weeks at a time.

IV. Out-door relief shall not be granted to any able-bodied person for a longer period than six weeks at a time.

V. Out-door relief shall not be granted, on account of the sickness of the applicant or any of his family, for a longer period than two weeks at a time, unless such sickness shall be certified in writing by the district medical officer as being likely to be of long duration or to be of a permanent character.

VI. Where relief is allowed to a parent through the admission of a child or children into the Swinton Schools or the workhouse, such relief shall not be granted for a longer period than six months at a time; and if at the expiration of such period a continuance of the relief is required, the relieving officer shall visit and inquire into the circumstances of the parent, and bring the case up for re-consideration by the Relief Committee, in the same manner as if it were a case of out-door relief.

(70.)
APPENDIX B.

PAPER handed in by Sir Hugh Owen, 19 April 1888

Statement showing the Mean Number, and the Ratio per 1,000 of Population, of Paupers relieved in the Metropolis on 1st July 1887, and the 1st January 1888, excluding Vagrants and Lunatics in Asylums, &c.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unions and Parishes</th>
<th>Population, 1881</th>
<th>Mean Number of Paupers relieved on 1st July 1887, and the 1st January 1888 (excluding Lunatics and Vagrants).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indoor.</td>
<td>Ratio per 1,000 of Population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West District:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>163,151</td>
<td>1,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>107,218</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>114,839</td>
<td>1,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>88,128</td>
<td>1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George’s, St.</td>
<td>140,748</td>
<td>2,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>40,549</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North District:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylebone, St.</td>
<td>154,110</td>
<td>2,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampstead, St. John</td>
<td>45,422</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancras, St.</td>
<td>236,358</td>
<td>3,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington, St. Mary</td>
<td>283,365</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>186,492</td>
<td>1,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central District:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomsbury, St. Giles and St. George</td>
<td>45,392</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, City of</td>
<td>31,439</td>
<td>1,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>30,352</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>101,805</td>
<td>6,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East District:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreditch, St. Leonard</td>
<td>126,501</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethnal Green, St. Matthew</td>
<td>126,061</td>
<td>2,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitechapel</td>
<td>71,263</td>
<td>1,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, St., in the East</td>
<td>47,157</td>
<td>1,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mile End Old Town</td>
<td>105,013</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar</td>
<td>156,510</td>
<td>1,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td>58,543</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South District:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savour’s, St.</td>
<td>115,164</td>
<td>3,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olave’s, Sc.</td>
<td>134,832</td>
<td>1,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>253,600</td>
<td>2,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth and Chatham</td>
<td>210,434</td>
<td>1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>186,500</td>
<td>1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>131,233</td>
<td>2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>72,548</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>80,845</td>
<td>1,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 3,815,704 50,632 13-3 41,606 10-9 92,298 24-2
**APPENDIX C.**

PAPERS handed in by Mr. John Jones, 30th April 1888:

Forms for use of Relieving Officer to supply Information to Board of Guardians.

**STATEMENT OF APPLICANT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Application</th>
<th>Name of Applicant and Family</th>
<th>When born</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Calling</th>
<th>Coalition</th>
<th>If Able-bodied</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Number in App. and Report Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RELATIVES.**

| Date of Statement |                     |           |           |         |           |                |          |                             |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|----------------|----------|                             |

Weekly Income from Wages -  
" " " Charities -  
" " " Club -  
" " " Relations -  
" " " Government Pensions.  

**Total Income** -  

Previous Addresses:—

Addresses of present or past Employers:—

Name, &c. of Club:—

References:—

Number of Rooms occupied  
Floor Rent  
Rent owing  
Amount of Pawn Tickets  

(70.)  
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**Friends of Applicant.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife's Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|------|-----------------------------|------|------------|-------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Children not at Home.</th>
<th>Age.</th>
<th>Residence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
A Digest of\} Case, Po.\}  

**Stepney Union.**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>District.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Nature of Application
2. Cause for Applying
3. Name of Applicant
4. Family consists of
5. Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man, aged years</th>
<th>Wife, aged years</th>
<th>And young children dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£. s. d.</td>
<td>£. s. d.</td>
<td>£. s. d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Income from Earnings
7. Club or Pension
8. Charitable sources
9. of old members of the Family at home
10. from Assistance rendered by Children and other Relatives not resident with Applicant
11. Amount of Debts and Pawn-tickets
12. Children and Relatives assist as far as they are able
13. Employers, past and present assist
14. The Destitution is chronic
15. Condition and surroundings of the Home
16. Evidence of Thrift
17. Character of the Family
18. Reliability of References and Informants
19. Other Particulars
20. Time in Poor Law District
21. Older Children living with Applicant
22. Relatives resident with Applicant
23. Known at previous Addresses.
24. Number of Rooms occupied
25. Weekly Rent Arrears of Rent
26. Present Net Income
27. Time out of Employ Cause
28. Parish Relief has been received. If received, when
29. To force Applicant into a Workhouse would be a hardship.

(70.)
The following shows the Number of Persons who were Chargeable to the *Stepney* Union, during the First Week in April of each Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE, First Week in April</th>
<th>In-door Poor</th>
<th>Out-door Poor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>4,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>2,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880*</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1880. From this time the number of patients in the Metropolitan Imbecile Asylums and the Fever and Small-pox Hospitals were included, but from 1871 to 1879 they were not included in these returns.
Appendix D.

Paper handed in by Miss M. H. Mason.

Form of "Undertaking" of Boarding Out Committee.

"We, the undersigned, being the Members of the Boarding Out Committee formed for the purpose of finding homes for pauper orphan or deserted children in the neighbourhood of *, do hereby engage truly and faithfully to observe, as regards all the children for whom we may find homes, the regulations which are prescribed in the Order of the Poor Law Board, dated 25th November 1870, or which may from time to time be prescribed by the Local Government Board, with respect to the Boarding Out of Pauper Children."

(Signed) ........................................................

(Here follow the signatures.)

Form of "Written Authority."

"We, the Local Government Board, hereby authorise the Boarding Out Committee, established in the neighbourhood of *, in the * Name of Town or Village Union, and composed of the following Members:

† ................................................................. † Name of Members.

‡ ................................................................. ‡ Name of President.

§ ................................................................. § Name of Secretary.

to enter into arrangements with Boards of Guardians for the purpose of finding and superintending homes for pauper children, under the provisions of the General Order, dated 25th November 1870."

(70.)
Form of "Undertaking" by the Foster-Parent.

"I,* foster-parent, do hereby engage, of ____________________________, in consideration of my receiving the sum of ______________________ per week, to bring up ____________________________ as one of my own children, and to provide with proper food, lodging, and washing, and to endeavour to train in habits of truthfulness, obedience, personal cleanliness, and industry, as well as in suitable domestic and out-door work; to take care that the said child § ____________________________ shall attend duly at church (or chapel), and shall, while boarded out, between the ages of four and twelve years, attend a school, unless prevented by sickness or other urgent cause, during all the usual hours for instruction thereat; in the case of the illness of the said child to report it to the Guardians of the__________________________ Union (or Parish), and also to the Boarding Out Committee of ____________________________, and at all times to permit the said child to be visited by any Member of the said Boarding Out Committee, and by any person specially appointed for that purpose by the Guardians of the ____________________________ Union (or Parish) or by the Local Government Board."

*[Note.—Where an allowance is made by the Guardians for the purpose, a stipulation should be inserted "to provide for the proper repair and renewal of the child's clothing." ]
### Appendix E.

**PAPER handed in by Sir Hugh Owen, K.C.B.**

Statement showing the Number of Vagrants in the Metropolis in the Third Week of April 1888.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unions</th>
<th>Number of Vagrants Relieved on the Last Day of the Third Week of April 1888.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST DISTRICT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George's</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of the West District</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH DISTRICT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marylebone</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampstead</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pancras</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of the North District</strong></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL DISTRICT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Giles and St. George</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of the Central District</strong></td>
<td><strong>286</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAST DISTRICT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreditch</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethnal Green</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitechapel</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George-in-the-East</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mile End Old Town</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of the East District</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH DISTRICT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Saviour's</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Olave's</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth and Clapham</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of the South District</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of the Metropolis</strong></td>
<td><strong>934</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement showing the Number of Vagrants Relieved in each Union in England and Wales on the 1st January 1888.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>DIVISIONS AND UNION-COUNTIES</th>
<th>DIVISIONS AND UNION-COUNTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Workhouse.</td>
<td>Number of Vagrants Relieved out of the Workhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.—THE METROPOLIS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1* Middlesex (part of)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2* Surrey (part of)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3* Kent (part of)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.—SOUTH EASTERN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2* Surrey (part of)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3* Kent (part of)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sussex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Southampt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Berks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.—SOUTH MIDLAND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1* Middlesex (part of)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Hertford</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Buckingham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Oxford</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Northampton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Huntingdon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Berfield</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Cambridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.—EASTERN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Essex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Suffolk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Norfolk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.—SOUTH WESTERN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Wiltz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dorset</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Devon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Cornwall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Somerset</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.—WEST MIDLAND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Gloucester</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Hereford</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Salop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Stafford</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Worcester</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Warwick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.—NORTH MIDLAND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Leicester</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Rutland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Lincoln</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Nottingham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Derby</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.—NORTH WESTERN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Chester</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Lancaster</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.—YORK DIVISION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 West Riding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 East Riding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 North Riding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.—NORTHERN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Durham</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Northumberland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Cumberland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Westmoreland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.—WELSH:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Monmouth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 South Wales</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 North Wales</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals of England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statement showing the Number of Vagrants Relieved in each Union, &c.—continued.

#### I.—The Metropolis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>St. George’s</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>St. Marylebone</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hampstead</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>St. Pancras</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Islington</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hackney</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>St. Giles and St. George, Bloomsbury</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>(a) 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>City of London</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shoreditch</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hackney (a)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Whitechapel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>St. George-in-the-East</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Stepney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mile End Old Town</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Poplar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II.—South Eastern Counties—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wandsworth and Clapham</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Woolwich</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II.—South Eastern Counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Epsom</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Chessy</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Barham</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Hambleton</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Teddington</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Crendon</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Dartford</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Gravesend and Milton</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>North Aylesford</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hoo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Milling</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Greenend Oaks</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tonbridge</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Tenterden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>West Ashford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Pinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Temple End</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Merton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Shepperton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Isle of Thanet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Eastry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Egham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Romney Marsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III.—South Midland Counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Bottesford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Halesham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Tichborne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Uckfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Cockfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76a</td>
<td>Chalvey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76b</td>
<td>Lowses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76c</td>
<td>West Fitle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76d</td>
<td>Newhaven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>St. Marying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Horsesham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Puttworth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Thame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>East Preston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>West Hampnett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Midhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Westbourne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Havant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Portsea Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Fareham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Ide of Wight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Lymington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Findonbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>New Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>South Stoneham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Romsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Stockbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>New Winchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Hurley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Catherington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Petersfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Alford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>AYton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Aldover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Kingsclere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Newbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Hungerford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Farnleigh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Wantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Walthamford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Braifield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Wokingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>East Hampstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Wilsbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 13. Holborn.—This number was returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
(b) 62. Isle of Thanet.—Of these, 14 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
(c) 118. Reading.—These were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.

(70.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. HERTFORD:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Bishop's Stortford</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Bishop's Stortford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Fayton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Hitchin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135a</td>
<td>Heathfield</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135b</td>
<td>Hitchin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>St. Albans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Watford</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Holloway</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Berkhamstead</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. BUCKINGHAM:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Averham</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Eton</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Wycombe</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Aylesbury</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Newport Pagnell</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OXFORD:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Henley</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Thame</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Headington</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Bicester</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Witney</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Chippen Norton</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Banbury</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. NORTHAMPTON:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Bredbury</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Towcester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Pottraysery</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Huntingstone</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Danbury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Thrapston</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Oundle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. HUNTINGDON:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>St. Ives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>St. Neots</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. BEDFORD:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Biggleswade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Ampthill</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Woburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Leighton Buzzard</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CAMBRIDGE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Causton and Arrington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Chesterton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Newmarket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Ely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>North Witchford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Whittlesley</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Wisbech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ESSEX:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Epping</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Ongar</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Romford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Osmund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Billericay</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Chippingford</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Rochford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Maidon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Tewking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>London and Winstree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Halstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Binstead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Dunmow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SUFFOLK:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Hildrige</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Genting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Berri St. Edmunds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Mildenhall</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Stonor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Harlesmore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Broomfields and Claydon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Saxmundford</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Wobouride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Primosage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Blythshire</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Wangford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Mufford and Lothringland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. NORFOLK:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Fleges, East and West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Smallberg</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Kinkington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Aylsham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>St. Faiths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Forehoe</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Blisfield</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Lexdon and Chavington</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Degowd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Gunthorax</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Warlin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Morford and Lanlitch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Walsingham</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Decking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Freebridge Lynn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>King's Lynn</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Dorvran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Swaffham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. WILTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Highworth and Swindon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Cricklade and Wooton Bassett</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Malmesbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Calne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Marlow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Devizes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Aylesham</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Westbury and Woetherelawdon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 191. Billericay.—Of these, 11 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 207. Mildenhall.—Of these, 4 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### V.—SOUTH WESTERN COUNTIES—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>U N I O N-C O U N T I E S A N D U N I O N S</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Pewsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Amesbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Alderbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Tisbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Merq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Sturminster</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Blaisdon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Wimborne and Cranborne</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Poole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Warehouse and Purbeck</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Corne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Sherborne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Bannister</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Axminster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Honiton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Bicester</td>
<td>(a) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Newton Abbot</td>
<td>(b) 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Totnes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Knightshedge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Plympton St. Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>East Stonehouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Stoke Damerel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Tavistock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Chelsham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Credenlon</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Tiverton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>South Molton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Barnstaple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Torrington</td>
<td>(c) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Bideford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Holsworthy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Stratton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Chumley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>St. Germans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Bodmin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>St. Columb Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>St. Austell</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Truro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Holton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Rolle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Porlock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Scilly Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI.—WEST MIDLAND COUNTIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>U N I O N-C O U N T I E S A N D U N I O N S</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Dukinfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Tewkesbury</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Overton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Tavistock</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Tavistock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Warley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Frome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Stepton Mallet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(370) Cannock.—Of these, 1 was returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
### APPENDIX

**Statement showing the Number of Vagrants Relieved in each Union, &c.—continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Union-Counties</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Union-Counties</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. — West Midland Counties—continued.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. WORCESTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375.</td>
<td>Stanbridge</td>
<td>(a) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>31. NOTTINGHAM—continued.</td>
<td>431. Nottingh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376.</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>432. Southwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377.</td>
<td>Tenbury</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>433. Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378.</td>
<td>Martley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>434. Bingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379.</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>32. DERBY</td>
<td>455. Shaleslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380.</td>
<td>Upton-on-Severn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>456. Derby</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381.</td>
<td>Keres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>457. Belper</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382.</td>
<td>Pershore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>458. Ashbourne</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383.</td>
<td>Droitwich</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>459. Chesterfield</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385.</td>
<td>King's Norton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>461. Clitheroe</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. WARWICK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>462. Glossop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386.</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>463. Hayfield</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387.</td>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388.</td>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389.</td>
<td>Ashfords</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390.</td>
<td>Nuneaton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391.</td>
<td>Foleshill</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392.</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393.</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394.</td>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395.</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396.</td>
<td>Stratford-on-Avon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397.</td>
<td>Acocks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398.</td>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399.</td>
<td>Southam</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. BUTLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400.</td>
<td>Latterworth</td>
<td>(b) 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401.</td>
<td>Market Harborough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402.</td>
<td>Billesdon</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403.</td>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404.</td>
<td>Hicknall</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405.</td>
<td>Market Bosworth</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406.</td>
<td>Ashby-de-la-Zouch</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407.</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408.</td>
<td>Barrow-on-Speck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409.</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410.</td>
<td>Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. LINCOLN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413.</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414.</td>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415.</td>
<td>Spalding</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416.</td>
<td>Holbeach</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417.</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418.</td>
<td>Skeford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419.</td>
<td>Grantham</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420.</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421.</td>
<td>Horncastle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422.</td>
<td>Spalding</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423.</td>
<td>Louth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424.</td>
<td>Caistor</td>
<td>(d) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425.</td>
<td>Glenfield Bridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426.</td>
<td>Goldthorpe</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. NOTTINGHAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427.</td>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428.</td>
<td>Workop</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429.</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430.</td>
<td>Retford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 375. Stanbridge.—These were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
(b) 400. Latterworth.—Of these, 4 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
(c) 418. Skeford.—Of these, 1 was returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
(d) 421. Caistor.—Of these, 2 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
(e) 425. Glenfield Bridge.—Of these, 2 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
(f) 472. Burnley.—Of these, 1 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
### IX.—York—continued.

**38. West Riding—continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Great Ouseburn</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Knaresborough</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Wetherby</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Knotley</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493</td>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>Saltburn</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>Malton</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497a</td>
<td>North Bierlow</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Humlet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Driffield</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Bramley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Dewsbury</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Hooesworth</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507b</td>
<td>Penstone</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507e</td>
<td>Wortley</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Boulby Castle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Sheffields</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Thorne</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Goole</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**39. East Riding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Pocklington</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>Horden</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>520</td>
<td>Selby Counties</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>Kingston-upon-Hull</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Patrington</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Skirlaugh</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Brighlington</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**37. North Riding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Malton</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>Bawtry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>Thirsk</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530a</td>
<td>Holmfield</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530b</td>
<td>Kirkby Moorside</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>Guisborough</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Middlebrough</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>Northallerton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>Bedale</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>Leyburn</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Aysgarth</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>Roth</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### X.—Northern Counties.

**38. Durham:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543a</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543b</td>
<td>Sedgfield</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td>Tosside</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**39. Northern Counties—continued.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>Eastburn</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>Houghton-le-Spring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>South Shields</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**40. Northumberland:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Newcastle-on-Tyne</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>Tyneemouth</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Castle Ward</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>Hebburn</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>Haltwhistle</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>Belford</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>Berwick-on-Tweed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>Rothbury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**41. Cumbeland:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>Alston-with-Garrigill</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>Poulton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571</td>
<td>Longtown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>572</td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>Wigton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575</td>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
<td>Bootle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XL.—Monmouth and Wales.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES AND UNIONS</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>580</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Abberavon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583</td>
<td>Bedwellity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>584</td>
<td>Pontypool</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>585</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**43. South Wales.**

- **(A) Glamorgan:**
  - 586 | Cardiff — | 14 |
  - 587 | Pontypool — | 20 |
  - 588 | Merthyr Tydfil — | 3 |
  - 589 | Bridgend and Cowbridge — | 1 |
  - 590 | Neath — | 1 |
  - 591 | Pontardawe — | 1 |
  - 592 | Swansea — | 1 |
  - 593 | Gower — | 1 |

- **(B) Carmarthen:**
  - 594 | Llanelli — | 5 |
  - 595 | Llandovery — | 1 |
  - 596 | Llanelli Ewy — | 1 |
  - 597 | Carmarthen — | 1 |

**Footnotes:**

- (a) 531. Middlebrough.—Of these, 3 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
- (b) 525. Berwick-on-Tweed.—Of these, 2 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
- (c) 577. East Ward—Of these, 2 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
- (d) 579. Kendal.—Of these, 14 were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
- (e) 583. Bedwellity.—These were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
- (f) 585. Newport—These were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.
- (g) 587. Pontypool.—These were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.

(70.)
Statement showing the Number of Vagrants Relieved in each Union, &c.—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>U N I O N - C O U N T I E S A N D U N I O N S</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>U N I O N - C O U N T I E S A N D U N I O N S</th>
<th>Total Number of Vagrants Relieved in the Union.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>Narberth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>Holywell</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
<td>618</td>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>Haverfordwest</td>
<td></td>
<td>619</td>
<td>Ruthin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>620</td>
<td>St. Asaph</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>621</td>
<td>Llanarwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Pembroke:

(d) Cardigan:

(e) Merioneth:

(f) Anglesey:

(a) 611. Knighton.—These were returned as relieved out of the workhouse.

Local Government Board, 28 April 1888.
### INDEX TO THE UNION-COUNTIES AND TO THE UNIONS.

#### THE UNION-COUNTIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION-COUNTIES</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>44 F</td>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
<td>43 A</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>43 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Radnor</td>
<td>43 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon</td>
<td>48 E</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kent (in Divisions I and II)</td>
<td>3 *</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavan</td>
<td>48 D</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmarthen</td>
<td>48 B</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnarvon</td>
<td>44 E</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surrey (in Divisions I and II)</td>
<td>2 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Merioneth</td>
<td>44 D</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denbigh</td>
<td>44 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>44 A</td>
<td>Wilt's</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>York (East Riding)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>44 B</td>
<td>North Wales</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>York (North Riding)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>York (West Riding)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### THE UNIONS.

The compound names are arranged alphabetically as pronounced. Thus "City of London" will be found under C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNIONS</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberavon</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>Battle</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Bridgford &amp; Cowbridge</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberbeigan</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>Beamister</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Bridgnorth</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberystwyth</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>Bedale</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Beilith (in Divisions I and II)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>Brillington</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcester</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>Bedingham</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>Bridport</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberbury</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>Belshill</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Belvic</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alnwick</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alston-with-Garrigill</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>Belper</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Berkhamstead</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altrincham</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>Berwick-upon-Tweed</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>Bromyard</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbridge</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Bethnal Green</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherstone</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>Bulith</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Bicester</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Buntingford</td>
<td>132 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampthill</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Bificdle</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Biggleswade</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Burton-on-Trent</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey</td>
<td>630 a</td>
<td>Billericay</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashbourn</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>Bilsden</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Barry St. Edmunds</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtead-in-Zouch</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Bingley</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston-under-Lyne</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>Birminham</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atcham</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Blankenhurst Stortford</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherstone</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>Blaby</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atcham</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td>474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axbridge</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Blansford</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axminster</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Blean</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Bledfield</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayesham</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Blythling</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aysgarth</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakewell</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Bootle</td>
<td>576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsall</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>Bosmere and Clayton</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbury</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor and Beaumaris</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>Bourn</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>Bradford (Wills)</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnstaple</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Bradford (York)</td>
<td>465 b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow-in-Furness</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow-on-Sear</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Bramley</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Regis</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton-upon-Irwell</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>Breastwick</td>
<td>608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basford</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Brentford</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basington</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedworth</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(70.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Freme</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>Kirkby Moorside</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-le-Street</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>Fylde</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>Knaresborough</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Gainsborough</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>Knighton</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Garstang</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>Lambeth</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippenham</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Gateshead</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>Lampton</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Norton</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Glandore</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Sodbury</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Glasshoughton</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Langport</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorlton</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Gooch</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>Leacon</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chudleigh</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Gower</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Stretton</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>Grantham</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>Leigh</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinderford</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>Great Milton</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>Leominster</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>Great Ouseburn</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consett</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Great Yarmouth</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>Guisborough</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>Leyburn</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conwy</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Guilliver</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>Lichfield</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookham</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Guisborough</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>Linlithgow</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corwen</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Backley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coton</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Hallam</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>Liskeard</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowbridge</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Halstead</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Llandudno Fawr</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crediton</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Hambledon</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Llandowery</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crickhowell</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>Llanfair</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crickhills and Woodstone, Easton</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Hardingham</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>Llanfairfil</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hartsamre</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Llanfairmor</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuckfield</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>Llanerch</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>Hartley Whitby</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Longtown</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwen</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Haslingden</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dereham</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>Hathfield</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>Havant</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Lunesdale</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Havertonwest</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>Lutton</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewsbury</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>Lutterworth</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docking</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Heddon</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Lymington</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolgelly</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>Hesley</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>Macmillon</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Holmepstead</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Holme</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Malton</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doverham</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Holmwood</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Malton</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>Holsted</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driffield</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>Henley</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droitwich</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>Henstock</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Market Bosworth</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droxford</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Market Harborough</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>Hertford</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulverton</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>Hexham</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>Marley</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Hidester</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>Hilston</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Mill Hill</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunstable</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Holbech</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>Mill Hill</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunstable</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Holbech</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>Mile End Old Town</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easington</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>Holborn</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastham</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Holtwick</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Milford and Lamastich</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbourne</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Hoxton</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Hoy</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>Morpeth</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hasting</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Horsecastle</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Preston</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Horsham</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Mottingham</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Houghton-le-Spring</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>Mt Mournay</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ward</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>Howden</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Stonehouse</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Hove</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecclesalla, Bierlow</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>Boxgrove</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>Buddersfield</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elham</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Hungerford</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Hunslet</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epworth</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hursley</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Insharch</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Isle of Thanet</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Imlington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fareham</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>Kirklinton</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farington</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Kingsclere</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farham</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Kingsbridge</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>King's Lynn</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festing</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Kings Norton</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flete, East and West</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>King's Lynn</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>Kingston-on-Hull</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forder</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>Kingston (Surrey)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthbridge</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forehouse</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericke Lynn</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Moreton</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIONS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>UNIONS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>UNIONS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bury</td>
<td>687a</td>
<td>St. Neots</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Tewkesbury</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwich</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>St. Olave, Southwark</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Torrington</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwich</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>St. Pancras</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Totnes</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwich</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>St. Saviour, Southwark</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>Towneley</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>Saffold</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>Tottot Park</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>Tregaron</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>Sandford</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>Trev</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>Tynesmouth</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>Selby Islands</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>Uckfield</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>Selston</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>Ulverstone</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>Uppingham</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Sedgfield</td>
<td>5419</td>
<td>Upton-on-Severn</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>Uttoxeter</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>Settle</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Utteridge</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswestry</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Sevenoaks</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oundle</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Shaffesbury</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shap</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>Sheff</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>Wantage</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipston-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wareham and Purbeck</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipston-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Warmaster</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>Shipton</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>Shipton</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Watford</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wayland</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wearhead</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wellingtonborough</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wellington (Salop)</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wellington (Somerset)</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wem</td>
<td>135b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wenlock</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>West Ashford</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>West Bromwich</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Westbury and Woolwell</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Westbury-on-Severn</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>West Derby</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>West Ely</td>
<td>76c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>West Hampnett</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>West Malling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>West Ward</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wetherby</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wharfedale</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Whiston</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Whitby</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Whitechapel</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Winchcombe</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wigtown</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wimborne and Cranborne</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wimborne</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Winecomb</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wiveliscombe</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wiveliscombe</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wirral</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wiveliscombe</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Witney</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Woburn</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wokingham</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wotton-under-Edge</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>371b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Woodville</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Worcestershire</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Workop</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Worle</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Wrexham</td>
<td>576b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>Wycombe</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Shifnal</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Yeovil</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Shipton-on-Stour</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F.

PAPER handed in by Mr. J. S. Horn.

BURNLEY UNION.

Typical Cases of Out-Relief.

1.—Sarah Ann Smith, 79, Bank Parade, Burnley,

Widow, with eight children, aged respectively 12, 10, 9, 7, 5, 4, 2, and 1.

This woman's husband died at the age of about 35. The grandmother of the children offered an asylum to the family and to take care of them whilst her daughter went to the mill if the Guardians would give a little out-relief. The Guardians made an order for 6s. weekly, and this allowance, with the mother's earnings of from 10s. to 15s., enabled the family to keep together until some of the children got to work. The family are now independent of Union relief, and the mother is in a position to stay at home to attend to domestic matters.

2.—Martha Davy, aged 38.

This woman was left a widow in the latter half of 1883, with five children aged from 13 to 4 years of age. The woman bore a good character, and was reputed to be steady and industrious. The Guardians made an allowance of 7s. 6d. per week, and by taking in washing the woman earned from 4s. to 5s. weekly. The eldest boy learned twisting, and earned first 6s., afterwards 9s. per week; the second boy got employment as a half-timer, and brought home 2s. 6d. per week. The relief was then reduced to 5s., and when in November 1886 the children were earning 14s. per week, the relief ceased.

3.—Ellen Burton.

At the age of 30 years was left a widow with four children, aged respectively 10, 9, 8, and 6. She was relieved with 5s. per week, and this amount with assistance derived from her parents enabled her to keep her home together, and bring up her children in a decent and respectable manner. When the eldest child commenced to work half-time the relief was reduced to 4s. per week, and by the time the eldest child was ready to work full-time the second was ready for half-time employment. The family were soon in a position to do without relief.

4.—James Hughes, a Dresser in a Foundry.

This man who had had the operation of tracheotomy performed on him for cancer in the throat, was thereby incapacitated from following his ordinary employment. He removed from Birmingham with his family, consisting of his wife and four children, to this Union with a view to obtain employment for his children in the Cotton Mills. When the family had been resident here about two months, application was made for relief, and 7s. per week was allowed. A few months later one of the children commenced to earn 6s. per week by winding (half-time), and the relief was reduced to 5s. per week. In a very short time the family will be able to maintain themselves.

5.—Agnes Holgate.

Widow, and five children, aged respectively 14, 11, 8, 5, and 3.

This woman came from Garstang to this Union, and had six children, one of whom died after her arrival. Like many others the woman left an agricultural district to obtain employment for her family in the Cotton Mills of the district.

The first allowance was for 7s. per week, but as the weekly earnings of the family increased the relief was reduced, and 3s. per week is now given. At the end of the current quarter (June 1888) the family will require no further relief.
6. Martha Lever.

This woman was left a widow with nine children, whose ages were respectively 17, 13, 12, 10, 8, 6, 4, 3, and 1; moreover, the woman was in a pregnant condition.

The family were relieved with varying amounts from 15s. downwards. The oldest son (17) was engaged in a foundry, and, unfortunately, was out of work for a considerable time, and one of the other children (aged 12) was of weak intellect. About six months ago the mother voluntarily requested the relieving officer to remove her name from the lists.

The above cases are typical of many of a like character which appear in the Relief Lists of the Burnley Union.

It will be observed that two of the cases cited properly belonged to other Unions, but, after considering all the circumstances, the Relief Committee rightly concluded that to have removed them to their respective places of settlement would have been harsh. Had they been removed they would probably have been recipients of relief for a very long period, whereas by the action of the Guardians the families will soon be in a position of independence and self-support.

By Order,

( signed) J. S. Horn,

Clerk to the Guardians.

Union Offices, Burnley,
8 June 1888.
APPENDIX G.

PAPER handed in by Lord Balfour of Barle, 21st June 1888.

Statement showing the Number of Paupers in the Metropolis on the last day of the last Week of January in each Year from 1857 to 1888.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Number of Paupers on last day of last Week of January</th>
<th>Number of Paupers in every 1,000 Inhabitants</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Number of Paupers on last day of last Week of January</th>
<th>Number of Paupers in every 1,000 Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>2,591,815</td>
<td>191,277</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>3,319,736</td>
<td>112,767</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>2,636,174</td>
<td>185,108</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>3,373,065</td>
<td>107,069</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>2,660,700</td>
<td>198,209</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>3,427,290</td>
<td>99,524</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>2,725,374</td>
<td>91,848</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>3,482,306</td>
<td>88,923</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>2,776,181</td>
<td>114,492</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>3,538,246</td>
<td>80,105</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>2,815,101</td>
<td>103,876</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>3,592,837</td>
<td>80,116</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>2,860,117</td>
<td>105,474</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>3,651,517</td>
<td>98,003</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>2,905,210</td>
<td>104,067</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>3,711,330</td>
<td>105,024</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>2,950,351</td>
<td>107,474</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>3,771,130</td>
<td>108,174</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>2,995,551</td>
<td>108,889</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>3,831,710</td>
<td>98,841</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>3,040,751</td>
<td>105,067</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>3,892,272</td>
<td>94,754</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>3,085,071</td>
<td>105,678</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>3,955,841</td>
<td>97,945</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>3,121,160</td>
<td>154,067</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>4,019,361</td>
<td>97,045</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>3,170,308</td>
<td>166,692</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>4,083,058</td>
<td>100,387</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>3,221,394</td>
<td>105,495</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>4,149,532</td>
<td>103,109</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>3,267,251</td>
<td>122,175</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>4,215,163</td>
<td>109,102</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is the estimated population in the middle of each year preceding the year for which the number of paupers is given.

** Total Pauperism of Metropolis.**

Population in 1881 - - - - - - 3,815,000.

Number of Paupers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Week of June 1888</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>55,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto - ditto 1887</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>54,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto - ditto 1886</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>51,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto - ditto 1885</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>51,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding patients in the Fever and Small-pox Hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board. The number of these patients on the last day of the week was returned as: 929 in 1888; 494 in 1887; 286 in 1886, and 1,445 in 1885.

Vagrants relieved in the Metropolis on the last day of the second Week of June 1888.

| Men | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 832 |
| Women | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 195 |
| Children under 16 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 34 |
| Total | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,061 |

Local Government Board, 20 June 1888. 
Fredk. Stevens, Statistical Department.
APPENDIX H.

PAPER handed in by Mr. L. Alexander, 28th June 1888.

Board of Guardians for the Relief of the Jewish Poor (established 1859),
13, Devonshire-square, Bishopsgate-street, E.

President—Benjamin L. Cohen, Esq
Vice-Presidents—Alderman Sir Henry A. Isaacs and F. D. Mocatta, Esq.
Treasurers—Francis A. Lucas, Esq., and Leopold de Rothschild, Esq.
Hon. Secretary—Lionel L. Alexander, Esq.

1. The Board efficiently combines many charities without undue centralization, seeking to minister to the varied wants of Jewish poor in the metropolis.

2. Ladies and gentlemen and the officials of the Institution personally visit the homes of the applicants; they thoroughly investigate and report upon the cases prior to adjudication, which is conducted by members of the Board, or its Committees, at personal interviews with the applicants.

3. In the year 1887 (exclusive of the industrial and loan departments), 3,415 cases representing about 11,600 persons, applied for relief, and assistance was granted to about 92 per cent. of them.

4. Permanent allowances are given to cases of old age, infirmity, and incurable disease. In 1887 these were paid to 176 families, at a cost of over 1,700 l.

5. The industrial department issues trade implements on loan, apprentices youths to remunerative trades and handicrafts, exercises supervision over the apprentices, and arranges for their technical instruction. At the close of 1887 there were 267 apprentices employed in 68 different and carefully selected trades.

6. There is a workroom where girls are trained to useful employment.

7. Loans of money, without interest, for the purposes of trade, are granted to deserving cases. About 1,760 l. was lent in 1887.

8. Five hundred and sixty-eight families, comprising 1,147 individuals, were, in 1887, assisted to emigrate, at a cost to the institution of over 1,300 l.

9. The immigration question receives constant attention, and much success has been achieved in checking undue migration from the East to this country.

10. The Sanitary Committee, during 1887, caused nearly 4,000 visits to be made to about 1,300 houses of the Jewish poor, and remedy was obtained of numerous unsanitary conditions therein.

11. About 12,620 investigations and reports were made by the Board during 1887 for various other charitable institutions and for private individuals.

12. A sum of about 13,300 l. was last year dispensed in relief by the Board, of which nearly 3,000 l. is repayable by the recipients.

13. The efficiency of the relief administered is proved by the fact that one-third of the number of persons relieved in any one year do not apply again.

14. The expenditure for the current year will, it is estimated, be 8,800 l. in excess of the reliable income.

15. An urgent appeal is made for undiminished financial support from the present contributors; for increased aid from those able to augment their benefactions, and for new assistance from those who have hitherto abstained from giving.

Annual subscriptions are most earnestly solicited.
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SAINT GEORGE'S UNION, MIDDLESEX.

Task of Work.

29 & 30 Vict. cap. 113, s. 15, enacts, "When the Guardians of any Union (or Parish) shall prescribe a task of work to be performed by any poor person to whom, or to whose wife, if he be liable to maintain such wife, or child, whether legitimate or illegitimate, under the age of 16, relief shall have been lawfully granted by such Guardians out of the Workhouse, such task being suited to the age, strength, and capacity of such person, and being of a nature and description of which the Local Government Board shall have previously approved, and such person shall refuse or wilfully neglect to perform such task, or shall wilfully destroy or damage any of the tools, materials, or other property belonging to the said Guardians, he shall be deemed to be an idle and disorderly person," and be liable to imprisonment and hard labour for a term not exceeding one calendar month.

Regulations.

1. The amount of work to be performed shall be as follows:—

Males.

Class A. Able-bodied: To break 8 baskets of granite or 12 baskets of York stone during the day (26 baskets to one yard).
Class B. Persons able to work, but of less capacity than those in class A.: To break five baskets of granite or eight baskets of York stone during the day.
Class C. Persons not capable of breaking stone: To pick 6 lbs. of oakum during the day.

Females.

Class D. Able-bodied: To pick 6 lbs. of oakum during the day.
Class E. Persons able to work, but of less capacity than those in class D.: To pick 4 lbs. of oakum during the day.
Class F. Persons required by the Board of Guardians to do needlework and other work.

2. The hours of labour shall be:—

For men, from 8 a.m. until 12 at noon, and from 1 to 4 p.m.
For women, from 8 a.m. until 12 at noon, and from 1 to 4 p.m.
For women who have children who are sent to school, from 9 until 12 at noon, and from 1 to 4 p.m.

3. The persons employed shall be under the supervision of the labour master.

4. The gates of the yard shall be opened a quarter of an hour before the time fixed for the men and women to commence their work, and none must be admitted half an hour after the time so fixed.

5. That a pint of gruel and a portion of the bread allowed by the under-mentioned scale of relief, be given to each person before commencing the task of work.

6. That an hour before the labourers leave off work, the labour master shall proceed to measure or weigh the task performed, and fill up the ticket accordingly.
### Scale of Relief.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily.</th>
<th>Money</th>
<th>Bread</th>
<th>Meat</th>
<th>Grocery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>2 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>2 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6 d.</td>
<td>2 d.</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>6 d.</td>
<td>3 d.</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>7 d.</td>
<td>3 d.</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>8 d.</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>9 d.</td>
<td>5 d.</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>10 d</td>
<td>4 d.</td>
<td>6 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>11 d</td>
<td>5 d.</td>
<td>6 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>11 d</td>
<td>5 d.</td>
<td>6 d.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A widower with children to be allowed the same amount of relief as if he had a wife. In the discretion of the relieving officer, two days' relief may be given on Saturdays.

By order,

Thomas Worlock,
Clerk to the Guardians.

23 February 1887.
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WANDSWORTH AND CLAPHAM UNION.—RELIEF WORKS.

To the Board of Guardians.

Gentlemen,

I have to report upon the Relief Works instituted by the guardians in February last, with a view to meeting the exceptional distress then prevailing.

On the 17th February the Board decided to adopt my suggestion for the employment of men out of work, upon land adjoining the new workhouse, in executing the foundations for the proposed new buildings, and in digging for sand and ballast, &c.

The sanction of the Local Government Board to the scheme having been readily obtained, notices were issued offering work in digging, &c., to the unemployed who had resided within the union for not less than twelve months. The limitation was necessary, in order to prevent the Relief Works from being overcrowded with applicants from all parts of the metropolis. The terms offered were 2s. 6d. per day of eight hours, and the working hours were from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m., and from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m.

In order that only deserving men should be employed, each applicant for work had to receive, in the first instance, an order from the Relieving Officer of the district in which he lived, and upon the production of this order he was received on the Relief Works.

The works were opened for the first time on Monday, 22nd February, when 200 men presented themselves with the requisite orders. This was the full number sanctioned by the guardians, but it was subsequently extended to 250, in consequence of the large number of deserving cases.

The main operations of these Relief Works were conducted on the surplus land on the east and west sides of the private roadway leading to the new workhouse.

It was necessary at the outset to purchase a comparatively large quantity of ordinary contractor’s plant, such as wheeling plank, picks, shovels, barrows, &c., the total cost of which has been £64, 2s. 3d. This plant will be available for all similar purposes in future, as well as for general use at the new workhouse.

The works executed have comprised the following:—

Surface digging to form yards for casual wards,
Excavation for foundations for casual wards.
Filling in concrete for casual wards.
Building brick footings for casual wards.
Concrete foundations for outdoor relief labour sheds.
Wheeling ground from site for casual wards on to site for outdoor relief sheds, and spreading and levelling same.
Wheeling garden mould from casual wards site on to airing yards for aged men and women at the new workhouse, and spreading, levelling, and forming gardens with same.
Wheeling, spreading, and levelling broken granite to form roadways at the new workhouse.
Forming coal cellar under engine house at new workhouse.
Partly building smithy.
Sundry works in connection with the machinery at the new workhouse, and other minor works.

Digging
Digging for sand and ballast at the surplus land, and filling in the pits with ground taken from the excavations for casual wards.

Rules were drawn up and posted on the works for the enforcement of order and discipline.

The average number of men at work each week was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week ending</th>
<th>February 27th</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>234 Men.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>March 6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>228 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>204 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>196 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>152 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>April 3rd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The works were finally closed on the 14th April, the number of men employed on that day being 68.

A large proportion of the men described themselves as labourers, but there were at least 34 workmen of various trades, viz.:—4 bricklayers, 1 pipe-fitter, 6 carpenters, 1 printer, 2 engine drivers, 2 bakers, 1 engine-fitter, 1 sawyer, 1 plasterer, 1 groom, 1 hatter, 6 painters, 2 ironworkers, 1 mason, 1 plasterlayer, 1 book porter, 1 Slater, and 1 dustman.

For the purposes of management and supervision there were employed:—

1 Labour Superintendent.
1 Pay Clerk.
1 General Foreman.
3 Gangers.

With reference to this question, it was found that increased supervision rendered the men's labour more remunerative.

The behaviour of the men, generally speaking, was orderly and good. Care was taken at the outset to eliminate the disorderly element, and one or two men, who were found inclined to give trouble and to neglect their work, were summarily dismissed, this making a marked impression upon the remainder.

Many men at the outset were, owing to the privations they had endured, physically unable to do much heavy work, and the gangers were accordingly instructed to put those upon lighter work for the first week or so; others, such as skilled workmen, were at first strange to the use of the spade, but time soon improved them. We had a difficulty with those skilled workmen, such as bricklayers, carpenters, and masons, whom we wished to employ at their own trades—they at first refusing to do such work—on the ground that it was degrading to ask them to do work at 3½ d. per hour, for which they were entitled, under ordinary circumstances, to receive 9 d. per hour. In connection with this part of the subject, I am of opinion that in all future relief works it will be advisable to limit the works strictly to those of unskilled labour only, as it is simpler in character, more easily directed and controlled, and, so far as I can see, more remunerative.

The total expenditure in respect of the relief works, including materials, has been 1,402 l. 15 s. 8 d., made up as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£.</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages to workmen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages for superintendence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant (including wheeling planks, tools, &amp;c.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£. 1,402 15 8

The actual value of the work done, inclusive of materials, is as under:

**Casual Wards.**

Surface digging over area for yards, excavating and concreting foundations, brick footings, &c. - - 406 -

**Outdoor Relief Labour Sheds.**

Surface filling up, spreading and levelling on yards, excavation and concreting foundation - - 84 -

Carried forward - - 490 -
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Brought forward - £. s. d.

490 -

NEW WORKHOUSE.

Carting earth for and forming gardens for aged men, and
women's airing yards, &c. - 185 -
Forming roadways with broken granite - 147 -
Works to engine and boiler house - 59 -
Partly building new smithy - 9 -
Work in connection with machinery - 8 -
Sundry works in new workhouse - 12 -

SUNDRIES.

Value of sand - 173 -
Ballast - 96 -
Timber sheds erected for workmen - 35 -
Bricks stacked on ground - 42 -

Total - £. 1,254 -

This leaves a balance of 149 l. to be accounted for. The original cost of the plant was
156 l. 2 s. 3 d. This plant would of course be retained as suitable for future use. Taking
its present value to be 120 l., and deducting this from the above-named balance of 149 l.,
there remains the sum of 29 l., which represents the actual loss incurred by these works,
which amount, together with the value of the sand, gravel, plant, and timber sheds, will
have to be paid out of current rates.

The establishment of these relief works enabled the guardians to ascertain, in the most
practical manner possible, the extent to which exceptional distress actually existed in the
union, and although in various parts of the metropolis there were varying opinions as to
the existence of such distress, it became evident that in this union there was a great
pressure among a large number of the unemployed. The fact that, as reported from time
to time by the relieving officers, twice as many men could have been put upon these
works, had it been possible to find them work to do, is the best evidence that considerable
distress existed. I have also ascertained from the relieving officers that the large majority
of the men employed had not in previous years received any assistance from the guardians.
This shows, I think, that the guardians were able, through the means of these relief
works, to assist many who were, so to speak, somewhat out of the ordinary scope of the
poor law, and to do so in a way that would not in any manner pauperise them, or destroy
their sense of independence.

With reference to the question as to whether such relief works could be made abso-
lutely self-supporting, I am of opinion that there will generally be a risk of a small loss,
and I consider that the pay of 2 s. 6 d. per day is slightly in excess of what will be
carried by a number of men brought together, many of them without any previous know-
ledge of the work to be done, and many at the outset, at least, physically incapable of
doing a hard day's work. But the loss need only be a small one, and a very small sum
indeed compared with what, in times of pressure, would be paid away in out-door relief,
and in indiscriminate private charity.

I venture to suggest that, in future instances of widespread distress, these relief works
should be conducted hand in hand with the distribution of any available charitable funds,
and that in all cases, where it is practicable, the relief should be given in payment for
work done, rather than as a charitable dole. In the case of a Mansion House Fund, or
any similar institution, grants should be made from such funds towards the loss incurred
by these relief works; and if this were done, many more men could be employed on the
works. But no money should be given to able-bodied men except as payment for work
done, even though such work might be unnecessary at the time.

It is only right to state that the several relieving officers have taken great pains in
selecting deserving men for these works, and I have also to acknowledge Mr. Mount's
indefatigable labours at the relief works in organising and arranging the work to be
done from day to day.

I am, &c.,

Thos. W. Aldwinckle,
Architect.

2, East India Avenue, Leadenhall-street,
2 June 1886.

Received and adopted by the guardians at their meeting, 3 June 1886.
Wandsworth and Clapham Union.

[The following Statement, compiled from Returns obtained by me from other Guardians’ Offices with reference to Stone and Labour Yards in the Metropolis, was prepared by Mr. Aeworth, and ordered by the Board to be printed and circulated amongst the Guardians.]

10 March 1887. 

E. H. Taylor, Clerk.

Stone Yards.

Less than half the Unions of the Metropolis have any labour-yard. There is none in any part of the East-end. On the other hand, every Union in South London, except Lambeth, has one. Two Unions appear to give out-door relief to able-bodied applicants with no fixed scale. In one of these the task is purely nominal. Various expedients are adopted in the eleven Unions from which Returns are available to meet the difficulty. Task, of men being unable to break granite. One Union has a special stone of a softer nature; a second requires only a portion of the full task for the first month; others have no fixed amount, but leave the matter to the discretion of the labour superintendent. Others again have wood-chopping, oakum-picking, and in one case digging, for those who are not considered fit for stone-breaking.

Only one Union besides our own has as few as six hours a day. Two have seven and a-half. The rest have seven. In three Unions the work begins at 8 a.m.; in one at 8.30; in the rest at 9 a.m. This latter hour, it is explained by one Board, is adopted to afford “an opportunity of seeking work.”

Three Unions only admit applicants to four days’ work in the week. Two others only on five days. On the other hand, in one Union two days’ relief may, in the discretion of the relieving officer, be given on Saturday.

The total amount of relief that can be obtained in a week is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s. d.</td>
<td>s. d.</td>
<td>s. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single man</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and wife and three children</td>
<td>9 4</td>
<td>5 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and wife and six children</td>
<td>13 8</td>
<td>6 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Wandsworth the scale is in these three cases: 5 s. 6 d., 11 s., and 12 s. 6 d., respectively.

Calculated per hour worked, the figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>d.</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single man</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and wife and three children</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and wife and six children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(70.) 4 T

In
In Wandsworth the rates per hour are 1½d., 3½d., and 4½d. respectively. This is calculating that 36 hours per week are worked as in the stone-yard. If the time worked at the sand sifting (32 hours) were taken, the rate per hour would, of course, be higher.

Four unions refuse single men entirely, in three others they appear only to grant them orders exceptionally. One union writes as follows: "every effort is made to limit, to as small an extent as possible, this branch of relief, as it is considered to be an introduction to pauperism, inducing a loss of independence calculated to tempt the recipient at any future time to seek the assistance of the parish on the slightest grounds. The relief is granted to those cases of able-bodied men in which it is considered by the relieving officer that the temporary assistance so afforded will be the means of keeping him off the rates, but in cases of habitual able-bodied paupers a workhouse order is offered, and, if accepted, the recipient is transferred to the test workhouse at Kensington. These cases, however, are very few, as the system has already acted as a deterrent." Other unions write that men of known bad characters are refused, or that the guardians consider each case on its merits.

_N.B._—In every case bread is taken as worth 6d. per 4 lb. loaf, and meat 6d. per lb.
Approximate List of Men Employed, as the Unemployed, at Alteration of Works, Wandsworth Infirmary, from Week ending 14th January 1887 to 6th May 1887.
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#### Approximate List of Men Employed, as the Unemployed, at Alteration of Works, Wandsworth Infirmary, from Week ending 14th January 1887 to 6th May 1887.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>January</th>
<th></th>
<th>February</th>
<th></th>
<th>March</th>
<th></th>
<th>April</th>
<th></th>
<th>May</th>
<th></th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>23rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bove</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>41½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemelcy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10⅔</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>50½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pethwick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>50½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41½</td>
<td>41½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44½</td>
<td>44½</td>
<td>45½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanseout</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33½</td>
<td>33½</td>
<td>33½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33½</td>
<td>33½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlewood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumridge</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36½</td>
<td>36½</td>
<td>36½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallinger</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43 4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shebben</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43 4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennessy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43 4½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks:**
- Left
- No use
- Stayed until employed by the guardians
- Came under Canon Clark's recommendation, and left
- Left to better himself
- Left us; tired of work
- Stayed some time
- Left
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Occu</th>
<th>Surv</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lovelace</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claffrer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouch</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed some time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liddy</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stayed some time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travey</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibbard</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatley</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father an inmate and died, and been on works all through No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehead</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodley</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Wells</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayling</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostead</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left to go to Price's Factory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'Donald</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left to go to Price's Factory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmore</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left to go to Price's Factory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higham</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Those entered as "No use" were discharged.

W. B. Spicer, Foreman.
APPENDIX L.

PAPER handed in by the Honourable Sydney Holland.

RETURN showing the Number of Days Spent In the Workhouse and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakley, William</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10 Mar. 1884</td>
<td>15 Mar. 1884</td>
<td>8 Jan. 1885</td>
<td>8 April 1885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7 Mar.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Dec. 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Jan. 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Dec. 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Jan. 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Dec. 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Jan. 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Dec. 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Jan. 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Dec. 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Jan. 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Dec. 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 Jan. 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley, William</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25 May 1885</td>
<td>8 June 1885</td>
<td>8 Aug. 1885</td>
<td>7 Aug. 1885</td>
<td>14 Aug. 1885</td>
<td>17 Aug. 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley, William</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29 Mar. 1886</td>
<td>5 April 1886</td>
<td>12 April 1886</td>
<td>12 April 1886</td>
<td>15 June 1886</td>
<td>22 June 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley, William</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20 Sept. 1886</td>
<td>4 Oct. 1886</td>
<td>17 May 1887</td>
<td>27 May 1887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>14 Sept.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley, William</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16 June 1887</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>27 June 1887</td>
<td>5 July 1887</td>
<td>8 July 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>6 Aug. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>6 Aug. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>6 Aug. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>6 Aug. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>6 Aug. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>6 Aug. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>6 Aug. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>6 Aug. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley, William</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>6 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>12 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>12 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>16 Sept. 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>7 Sept. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 Oct. 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley, William</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23 April 1888</td>
<td>27 April 1888</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>7 May 1888</td>
<td>15 May 1888</td>
<td>10 May 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Ann</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley, William</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6 June 1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 June 1888</td>
<td>19 June 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX L.

**PAPER handed in by the Honourable Sydney Holland.**

**Number Spent Out by certain Families, during the Years 1884 to 1888.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Discharged</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Discharged</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Discharged</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Discharged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 Aug. 1885</td>
<td>21 Aug. 1885</td>
<td>29 Aug. 1885</td>
<td>15 Sept. 1885</td>
<td>26 Oct. 1885</td>
<td>27 April 1885</td>
<td>29 April 1885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 July 1887</td>
<td>12 July 1887</td>
<td>14 July 1887</td>
<td>18 July 1887</td>
<td>18 July 1887</td>
<td>22 July 1887</td>
<td>23 July 1887</td>
<td>28 July 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Mar. 1888</td>
<td>3 April 1888</td>
<td>5 April 1888</td>
<td>12 April 1888</td>
<td>12 April 1888</td>
<td>16 April 1888</td>
<td>19 April 1888</td>
<td>23 April 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 April 1888</td>
<td>3 April 1888</td>
<td>12 April 1888</td>
<td>16 April 1888</td>
<td>16 April 1888</td>
<td>23 April 1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(70.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Discharged</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Discharged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, William</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10 October 1885</td>
<td>22 October 1885</td>
<td>22 October 1885</td>
<td>26 October 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Mary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18 November 1885</td>
<td>10 December 1885</td>
<td>19 December 1885</td>
<td>28 December 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Elizabeth</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18 November 1885</td>
<td>10 December 1885</td>
<td>19 December 1885</td>
<td>28 December 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Mary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26 January 1886</td>
<td>8 February 1886</td>
<td>9 February 1886</td>
<td>22 February 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Mary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23 March 1886</td>
<td>29 March 1886</td>
<td>1 April 1886</td>
<td>5 April 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Mary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11 November 1886</td>
<td>25 November 1886</td>
<td>26 November 1886</td>
<td>9 December 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Mary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3 February 1887</td>
<td>16 February 1887</td>
<td>17 February 1887</td>
<td>2 March 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Mary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25 March 1884</td>
<td>3 April 1884</td>
<td>3 April 1884</td>
<td>8 April 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Margaret</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29 May 1884</td>
<td>12 June 1884</td>
<td>12 June 1884</td>
<td>26 June 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Margaret</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8 August 1884</td>
<td>13 August 1884</td>
<td>13 August 1884</td>
<td>21 August 1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Margaret</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6 January 1886</td>
<td>22 January 1886</td>
<td>2 February 1886</td>
<td>22 February 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Mary</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12 September 1887</td>
<td>29 September 1887</td>
<td>27 December 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Mary</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11 May 1888</td>
<td>22 May 1888</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Hannah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20 November 1885</td>
<td>8 December 1885</td>
<td>8 December 1885</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>To Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 December 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>15 December 1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Mary</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5 November 1886</td>
<td>11 November 1886</td>
<td>25 November 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Mary</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18 February 1887</td>
<td>18 February 1887</td>
<td>3 March 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number Spent Out by certain Families, during the Years 1884 to 1888—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 October 1885</td>
<td>5 November 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>16 November 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 December 1885</td>
<td>29 December 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 January 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 February 1886</td>
<td>26 February 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>4 March 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 April 1886</td>
<td>13 April 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>9 October 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 December 1886</td>
<td>30 December 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>31 December 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 March 1887</td>
<td>16 March 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>17 March 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 April 1884</td>
<td>1 May 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>1 May 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 June 1884</td>
<td>10 July 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>10 July 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 August 1884</td>
<td>25 August 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>12 September 1884</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September 1885</td>
<td>21 September 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>26 September 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 1888</td>
<td>Ashford,</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>4 March 1886</td>
<td>1 April 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 January 1887</td>
<td>15 January 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>10 February 1887</td>
<td>5 March 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 January 1888</td>
<td>19 January 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>19 January 1888</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 December 1885</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 November 1886</td>
<td>Ashford,</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>9 December 1886</td>
<td>4 January 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 March 1887</td>
<td>17 March 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>17 March 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(70.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Hannah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26 April 1887</td>
<td>Ashford, 28 April 1887</td>
<td>26 May 1887</td>
<td>ditto ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Annie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Catherine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Hannah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7 July 1887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Annie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 July 1887</td>
<td>ditto ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Catherine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 September 1887</td>
<td>ditto ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Hannah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26 November 1887</td>
<td>Ashford, 8 December 1887</td>
<td>27 December 1887</td>
<td>ditto ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Annie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Catherine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Hannah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2 March 1888</td>
<td>16 March 1888</td>
<td>16 March 1888</td>
<td>29 March 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Annie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Catherine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Hannah</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27 April 1888</td>
<td>10 May 1888</td>
<td>14 May 1888</td>
<td>21 May 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Annie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Catherine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goss, James</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16 June 1888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Maude</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; George</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walford, Julia</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21 July 1886</td>
<td>27 July 1886</td>
<td>3 August 1886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Alice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, William George</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20 July 1886</td>
<td>Ashford, 22 June 1886</td>
<td>19 August 1886</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; William George</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, William George</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21 October 1886</td>
<td>29 October 1886</td>
<td>30 October 1886</td>
<td>12 November 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; William George</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, William George</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23 December 1886</td>
<td>31 December 1886</td>
<td>3 January 1887</td>
<td>20 January 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; William George</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, William George</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8 March 1887</td>
<td>18 March 1887</td>
<td>22 March 1887</td>
<td>31 March 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; William George</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, William George</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19 April 1887</td>
<td>22 April 1887</td>
<td>22 April 1887</td>
<td>27 April 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; William George</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Martha</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22 April 1887</td>
<td>28 April 1887</td>
<td>28 April 1887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Ellen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Ada</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number Spent Out by certain Families, during the Years 1884 to 1888—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 May 1887</td>
<td>9 June 1887</td>
<td>9 June 1887</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>23 June 1887</td>
<td>4 July 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 September 1887</td>
<td>3 October 1887</td>
<td>4 October 1887</td>
<td>13 October 1887</td>
<td>24 November 1887</td>
<td>25 November 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 1888</td>
<td>5 April 1888</td>
<td>7 April 1888</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27 April 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 May 1888</td>
<td>7 June 1888</td>
<td>7 June 1888</td>
<td>21 June 1888</td>
<td>21 June 1888</td>
<td>To service, 19 August 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 June 1888</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 1886</td>
<td>20 August 1886</td>
<td>20 May 1887</td>
<td>25 May 1887</td>
<td>27 May 1887</td>
<td>22 June 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 October 1886</td>
<td>5 October 1886</td>
<td>7 October 1886</td>
<td>14 October 1886</td>
<td>14 October 1886</td>
<td>21 October 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 November 1886</td>
<td>25 November 1886</td>
<td>27 November 1886</td>
<td>10 December 1886</td>
<td>10 December 1886</td>
<td>23 December 1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 January 1887</td>
<td>4 February 1887</td>
<td>4 February 1887</td>
<td>17 February 1887</td>
<td>17 February 1887</td>
<td>4 March 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 1887</td>
<td>7 April 1887</td>
<td>7 April 1887</td>
<td>13 April 1887</td>
<td>13 April 1887</td>
<td>15 April 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>27 May 1887</td>
<td>27 May 1887</td>
<td>9 June 1887</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 May 1887</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY of before-mentioned RETURNS, showing the Number of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.N.</th>
<th>O.U.T.</th>
<th>Days.</th>
<th>Then took discharge and remained out for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>ditto ditto ditto 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ditto ditto 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ditto ditto 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ditto ditto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>ditto ditto 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ditto ditto 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto ditto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ditto ditto 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ditto ditto 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ditto ditto 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ditto ditto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto ditto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto ditto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.N.</th>
<th>O.U.T.</th>
<th>Days.</th>
<th>Then took discharge and remained out for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto ditto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto ditto 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ditto ditto 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# DAYS spent In the WORKHOUSE and the Number spent Out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IN.</strong></td>
<td><strong>OUT.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Days.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Days.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were In for</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(70.) 4 x 4