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The public mind seems for the present averse to the discussion of questions which divide political parties. As if over-strained by the effort necessary to carry the great measures of late years, it now shows a marked disinclination for any enterprize which would give rise to similar tension and excitement. We may be pretty sure that this temper will not be of very long duration: what it is the fashion to call "burning questions" will again arise and demand solution. But during the lull, we have an excellent opportunity of making up arrears in those branches of legislation in a special sense called social, which are apt, amidst the war of parties, to be thrown into the shade and overlooked. Of such questions, those most strongly recommended to us by feeling, as well as pressed on us by prudence at the present time, are those directly affecting the well-being of the working classes.

In the last session of Parliament some progress was made with measures of this kind. The just sense of dignity of the working man, and the principle of equality before the law, were satisfied by the new legislation respecting the relation between employer and employed, something was done towards the improvement of the dwellings of artizans in great cities; and the attention of the community was fixed with a steadiness and resolution that defied evasion on the provisions necessary for the safety of our sailors. Various symptoms, and in particular several notices on the list of bills to be introduced into Parliament, make it probable that in the coming session there will be brought under public consideration a large and...
comprehensive question vitally important to our working classes, and
to the welfare of society in general—I mean the Poor Laws. Having
studied this question seriously some years since, and having had my
attention lately recalled to it by interesting circumstances, I thought,
when requested to deliver the annual address to the Statistical
Society, that I might usefully occupy you on this occasion with some
important and more or less novel aspects of the subject

English Charity and English Poor-Law.

For a long time there has existed in England a great and growing
dissatisfaction, both with the working of private charity and the
operation of the public system of poor-relief. It has been felt that
on the one hand, the action of private charity needed to be concen-
trated and systematized, so as to defeat attempts at imposition, and
prevent the overlapping of different agencies taking up the same
ground; and that on the other, the mechanical hardness and uni-
formity of the Poor Law system, required to be tempered and adapted
to individual cases by personal and sympathetic knowledge of the
circumstances of the poor. To see that the state discharges its duty
by relieving all real distress in the most effectual possible manner,
to guard against the waste of either public or private funds devoted
to that object, and at the same time to exercise on the poor, through
personal and friendly intercourse, a strong though gentle influence
tending to assist their efforts, rectify their habits, and rebuke their
vices—these are the essential aims to be attained, and it is plain that
they can be achieved only by bringing public and private action into
relation, and making them assist and complete each other.

The Elberfeld System of Poor Relief.

Many might be disposed to set aside as a utopian scheme this idea
of a harmonious combination between official and volunteer agency.
But the news of the existence of an organization of this kind at
Elberfeld, in Prussia, tended to shake the spirit of sceptical despon-
dency. The method there followed is substantially this—All the relief
given by the state is what we call out-door relief. The poor requir-
ing relief are divided into groups, each group consisting of a few
families. Each cluster of families is committed to the special care
and supervision of an intelligent volunteer visitor, who goes in and
out among them, making himself acquainted with their daily lives,
their past history, their present resources and circumstances. These
volunteers are persons who cannot give much of their time to the work
—they are persons with homes, domestic ties, and varied interests
and occupations of their own, and they are not expected to deal with
more than a very few families. This plan has been decidedly suc-
cessful. An Inspector* of the English Local Government Board was
charged, in 1870, to examine into its working on the spot, and he
found that it formed such a check on imposture as our relieving offi-
cers could not supply, and that it tended to depauperize the objects

* Mr. A. Doyle. See Reports on Poor Laws in Foreign Countries, published
by the English Local Government Board, 1875.
of public charity much more effectually than any methods adopted at home. It has been established for more than twenty years. Three years after its introduction, the number of paupers in Elberfeld was reduced from 4,000 to 1,528. The city, in the year before the plan was adopted, contained 50,364 inhabitants. Miss Schuyler of New York visited Elberfeld last year, and found the system in full operation. The number of visitors has remained unaltered; but owing to the reduction of paupersm, though the population has increased by more than 50 per cent, the number of families under the supervision of each visitor, which was originally four, has been diminished to two.

The London Charity Organization Society, and the Marylebone plan.

There was established in London, in 1869, a society commonly known as the Charity Organization Society. It was formed with the intention of remedying acknowledged abuses in the administration of charitable relief, and also to repress the profitable trade of mendicancy, pursued by many who had no claim upon the public for support. Thirty-five branches, or district committees, of this body now exist, covering nearly the whole area of the metropolis, and some of the most influential citizens of London take part in its working. It conducts, chiefly through volunteer and partly also through paid agency, inquiries into the cases of persons seeking relief or employment. Out of the existence of the society, and in close relation to it, has arisen a special system of dealing with the poor in a part of the parish of Marylebone, which has considerable resemblance, with some marked differences, to the Elberfeld plan. An account of it has been given in reply to a request from Mr. Stansfeld, the late President of the Local Government Board, by Miss Octavia Hill, well known for her admirable efforts for improving the homes and home life of the London poor.* There existed, in the district to which I refer, a committee having in its hands funds available for charitable purposes, and composed of experienced and trustworthy men of different classes. There also existed a body of district visitors through whom the charitable funds disposed of by the committee were distributed. Miss Hill being a member of the local Charity Organization Society, which is an inquiring body, was asked to join the committee I have spoken of, which is a relieving body. She was appointed referee, her functions being, on the one hand, to furnish to the committee such information respecting any family seeking relief as had been obtained through the Charity Organization Society, and on the other, to act as medium of communication between the relief committee and the district visitors. These visitors, both through the information furnished to them, and through their own personal relations with the poor, were in possession of the history and circumstances of every case, and had all such particulars entered in a condensed and readily available form in their district

* See Appendix to Report of English Local Government Board for 1874. Miss Hill's Report, and some other valuable papers by her, have been reprinted by the New York State Charities Aid Association, under the title of Homes of the London Poor (New York, 1875)
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books. Abundant security for right management was thus supplied, by the joint action of the Charity Organization Society, the committee, and the visitors. When this machinery had been in operation for some time, the guardians of the corresponding Poor Law district resolved to use the agencies I have described to assist them in the performance of their duties. Miss Hill, as centre of these agencies, was brought into communication with the guardians. The relieving officer was directed to send her daily a list of applicants, with their addresses, and a statement of the nature of the application. She sends out the particulars to the visitors, who furnish, in reply, all the information either already in the district book or obtained by a fresh visit, which they think the Poor Law authorities ought to have before them. Of course matters of a private nature, which could not be disclosed without breach of confidence, are neither recorded in the book, nor disclosed to the guardians. The information furnished is forwarded to the relieving officer. He is thus often made aware of facts he ought to know, but might not otherwise ascertain, and clues for further investigation are supplied. In particular, it appears whether the applicant is already in receipt of aid from the visitor herself, or from the various charitable bodies. The decision of the board of guardians in each case is announced to Miss Hill, and is entered by the visitors in the district books.

A system of this kind would, as Miss Hill says, if properly carried out, ensure that outdoor relief should be confined to the deserving, and that drunken and idle people should be offered the workhouse only. At the same time, cases which the Poor Law could not adequately meet, would be in whole or part dealt with by the charitable committee, and thus official and private action would assist and supplement each other. And earnest and judicious visitors might do much by their personal influence—might sometimes find employment for those who are likely without it to come on the rates—might induce the more prosperous relations of the indigent to contribute towards their maintenance—and might see that the education of the children is not neglected.

The main difference between the Elberfeld and the Marylebone system appears to be in favour of the latter. It consists in this; that in Elberfeld the volunteer visitors have a voice in deciding on the parochial relief to be given through them. In Marylebone no such power or responsibility belongs to them; they merely bring information; the guardians vote the relief. This tends to keep the relation between the visitor and the poor on a more satisfactory basis; for while it is known that she will hear and represent their claims and do her best to place them in a just and true light before the authorities, it is also known that with the absolute award or refusal of relief she has nothing to do.

The key to the efficiency of the whole plan seems to lie in the choice of a referee. Much will indeed depend on the selection of visitors of strong sense as well as good heart, who will be at once kind and firm in their dealings with the poor. But it is above all things necessary that the one person who is in relation with the visitors on one side, and with the guardians and charitable committee
on the other, should be thoroughly competent for, and devoted to, the work—possessing an energetic character, practical ability, and business habits, and thus able to enforce the carrying out of all the operations of the system with regularity and promptitude.

The State Charities Aid Association of New York.

This new and, as I believe, fruitful idea of the co-operation of the independent citizen with public authorities, in dealing with destitution, has taken shape amongst our American brethren in the great organization known as the State Charities Aid Association of New York. This body has for its president an able and energetic lady, Miss Louisa Lee Schuyler. I have read with much interest the third annual report, which contains, besides a detailed account of the vast and varied work of the association, an excellent opening address delivered by Miss Schuyler at the first general meeting in December last. There is something very striking in the sight of these remedial agencies carried on under the direction of noble-minded women in two great centres like London and New York, where, alongside of such accumulated wealth and splendour of material civilization as is scarcely elsewhere to be found, there exists a seething mass of misery and moral degradation, perhaps equally unexampled. I am sure no masculine prejudice will prevent any of us from heartily wishing them good speed in their sacred work.

The objects of the Association over which Miss Schuyler presides are: "First, to ensure a more faithful and efficient administration of the present poor-law system of the State of New York; and second, to improve the system itself, through legislative action based upon principles comprising the alleviation of suffering and the reduction of pauperism." One of the most important means of action which it has set on foot is the organization of "Visiting committees throughout the state, for public charitable institutions, and also for the recipients of out-door relief." An act has been passed by the legislature, at the suggestion of the association, empowering the State Board of Charities to appoint unpaid local visitors for public institutions; and some of the visitors in connection with the association have been thus appointed. The recognized position thus given them is found highly valuable, and a spirit of harmonious co-operation prevails between officials and volunteers.

This conception of clothing local persons, selected for their superior ability and purity of life, with a public character as inspectors only, without any right of direct intervention in the government of institutions, seems to me to be capable of extended and important application. By this method, whilst official responsibility is not weakened or divided, permanent organs are provided to observe in the name and in the interest of the community; and the tendency of this must be to correct abuses and point the way to improved modes of proceeding. In America, as in England, there is general dissatisfaction with the present administration of charity—public and private, and I think this association gives every promise of being a most effectual helper in the work of reform.

It may be worth while to ask whether here in our own country
and city some movement in the same direction is not needed—
whether the wealthy and influential, though never deficient in
liberality when their aid is invoked for cases of distress, have
not been too supine and passive with respect to the administration
of our charities, and too willing to devolve on others—on the
officials of societies, or on the clergy, often overburdened with
their strictly spiritual duties—the management and control of our
agencies for the relief of the poor. In London, we have seen, and
it is said in all the principal towns of England and Scotland, Charity
Organization Societies have been formed, to check abuse and to make
the assistance given more really helpful. Here, too, I think there
is room for similar action. Those who wish what aid they can afford
to poverty to be judiciously expended, are often at a loss how to test
the truth of what is told them, and to learn something of the char-
acter and conduct of applicants. I fear cases are not infrequent,
similar to those we hear of in London, of “poor families assisted
by two or three agencies at times when they need help least, and
others neglected by all when they need it most.” I am convinced
that if the zeal, the ability, and the resources already spent in
isolated or desultory efforts in the cause of charity, were con-
centrated and organized, and brought in some degree into relation
with the operations of the Poor Law, far more substantial and perma-
nent good would be done, and the deserving poor and the burdened
tax-payer would alike have reason to bless the change.

How are Pauper Children to be reared?

But great as is the value of efforts based on sound principles, and
wisely ordered and combined, for the benefit of the adult poor, it is
the children who are the most important and the most hopeful ob-
jects of such effort. Their characters are still in process of formation
—their habits are not yet definitively fixed. By dealing with them,
by giving them the ability and cultivating in them the desire of
supporting themselves by honest industry, we may hope, in the ex-
pressive phrase of a writer on this subject, “to cut off the entail of
pauperism.” Accordingly, this question has engaged the attention
of earnest inquirers, and various methods have been tried, with dif-
ferent degrees of success, for bringing up and training children who
come, or but for timely help would come, under the operation of our
Poor Law system, so that they may in after life take their place as
members of the independent and self-supporting working class.

The Workhouse and the District School.

It is now some five and thirty years since a Report of the English
Poor Law Commissioners pointed out in strong terms the evils at-
tendant on rearing children in workhouses; and the most expe-
rienced Inspectors have both then and since borne emphatic testi-
mony to the same effect. “Workhouses, and the whole system of
their organization,” said Mr. Jelinger Symons, “are alien to the
proper treatment and training of the young.” “The atmosphere of a

workhouse," said Mr. Tufnell, "is tainted with vice, no one who regards the future happiness of the children could ever wish them to be educated within its precincts." "A workhouse," said the Report itself, "cannot, without the greatest attention to classification, be made a place in which young girls can be removed from the chance of corruption." Similar statements of opinion from those most competent to judge might be adduced in great number. As a result of the convictions on this subject so generally entertained, the policy has been pursued in England of locally separating the school from the workhouse, and removing adult paupers from every office in the establishments in which the children are reared. Besides these Separate schools, as they are called, which receive the children belonging to a single union, there have been established District schools, in which the children from a number of different unions are brought together. These last are vast and costly institutions, with a great array of officers, with elaborate material appliances of every kind, and giving to their pupils a superior order of intellectual instruction. That a considerable improvement in some directions has thus been wrought cannot be doubted, and one of the official founders of the District school system has lately gone so far as to assert that it is the *ne plus ultra* in the education of this class of children; that nothing ever devised for the purpose can equal or even approach its success.

But whilst these confident panegyrics are heard on one side, there has been rising and gradually growing in strength another and a different view of the matter. It is alleged that, imposing as are these great establishments to the eye of the occasional visitor, they are in the really vital and essential respects, gigantic failures; nay, more, that being founded on erroneous principles and working by mistaken methods, they are by the laws of human nature predestined to failure.

*Mrs. Nassau Senior's Inquiry into District Pauper Schools as places for rearing Girls.*

What has lately fixed public attention on this controversy, which had long been going on less noticeably, was a step taken by Mr. Stansfeld, the late President of the Local Government Board, who is honorably distinguished by his freedom from formalism and his boldness of initiative. In January, 1873, desiring to have "the woman's view" as to the effect on girls of the system of education in pauper schools, he asked Mrs. Nassau Senior to visit the workhouse schools and report to him the conclusions at which she arrived. That lady undertook the task, and inquired carefully—first, into the working of the system in the schools; and, secondly, as far as she found it possible, into the after career of the girls who had been placed out in the world. Her conclusions, which she stated in a very able Report,* were substantially these: that, while the schools have great merits in some respects, on the whole, both with respect to the phy-

*This Report is given, with other interesting matter, in *Boarding-out and Pauper Schools*, by Menella B. Smedley, London, Henry S. King and Co., 1875.*
sical development, and the intellectual, moral, and industrial training of the young in relation to their future career, they are open to the gravest, and, as it concerns the girls, decisive objections; and secondly, that the results, as seen in the after life of the girls trained in these schools, is unsatisfactory.

To her Report a reply* has appeared from the pen of Mr Tufnell, late Inspector of the Poor Law schools in the metropolitan district, in which he disputes Mrs. Senior's facts and arguments with a warmth which may, I think, be called at least excessive, though perhaps in one who has devoted a great part of his life to the construction of the District school system, it is not altogether unnatural. Round the question thus raised, a war of pamphlets and magazine articles has been raging, and the controversy has produced quite a small literature of its own. Though the issue immediately involved is strictly an English one, the discussion turns on important principles, and is thus, as it seems to me, full of interest and instruction for ourselves.

How to deal with the Children of the State.

I do not at present purpose to go into the whole question, but to consider only the case of one large class of the children. There is a steady flow through the schools of what are called casual children—that is, those whose parents are at the time receiving relief in the workhouse, and who remain for variable, but of course usually for brief periods. But those who are most completely thrown on the care of the Poor Law authorities are the permanent juvenile inmates of the schools—the orphans and deserted children. These are emphatically the “Children of the State,” who are most entirely at its disposal, whose destinies it can most powerfully affect, and for whose guardianship and training it is in the highest degree responsible. Now with respect to these, the mode of management proposed by Mrs. Senior, is that which you have heard more than once advocated in this society!—that, namely, of boarding them out in cottage homes. Convinced myself more than ever by a careful study of the recent controversy, that this is the right method, I wish to exhibit as well as I can the general facts of human nature and child nature which recommend it to our adoption, and to lay before you the evidence which other countries and our own are able to contribute with respect to its practical working.

What is the object we are to keep steadily before us in devising a training for these children of the state? Surely nothing very high-flown or of exceptional greatness. They labour under natural disadvantages, the operation of which we may alleviate, but can rarely altogether annul. If we can place these unfortunate little ones in the same position with the average of the self-sustaining working

class, we shall have done all that can be reasonably expected. That they should take their place undistinguished in the mass of our labouring people without permanent inferiority, and free from any stamp of degradation, is the mark at which we have to aim. For this it is necessary that they should get as good elementary instruction as favourably circumstanced members of that class usually obtain. But further and still more do they need to have their powers of self-help and general practical intelligence fairly cultivated; and last, and most important of all, they ought to have their moral natures healthily developed—their affections, so far as their unhappy situation admits, drawn out and fostered, and links of friendly relation established between them and those amongst whom, as their seniors and coevals, they will begin, if they do not continue, their adult life as independent members of society.

Importance of Family Life, especially for the training of girls.

Now how are these results most likely to be attained? How are they attained in the normal case of the child of a respectable working man? There is but one answer to the question—in and through family life. In the family circle, however humble, if only virtuous, the child obtains the best training for real life; has his nature best developed; is drawn towards others by affection, and feels that others are drawn towards him; is conscious that he is the object of individual regard, individual care, and discipline. It would be idle to spend time in proving, what all experience has shown, that the family is the true school of the heart. Take next the intellect, and consider the amount of useful, practical knowledge picked up spontaneously by children sheltered in a family, and yet in frequent though guarded contact with the outer world—no artificial and exceptional, but the real outer world of common objects and common human society in which their lives are to be spent. Consider, again, the natural, easy quickening of the active powers, by the rendering of real little offices and the performance of real little tasks which arise in daily family life, and the whole practical education which grows out of the imitation of elders, and the assistance given them in the actual work of the world. If we add to these domestic and social influences the ministrations of religion, and the teaching of a good day-school, we have a view of the circumstances under and through which the best members of our working classes are formed in their early years. This is true of both sexes; but all experience proves, what we might perhaps predict from what we know of the constitution of female nature in particular, that home training is especially necessary for girls. They require individual notice, tenderness, sympathy, more than boys, and the best of them are usually those—as has been strikingly said—who have had most mothering. This, then—the family system—is the natural method of rearing the young, and it surely follows that the best thing we can do for the orphan is to place him in circumstances and relations approaching as closely as possible to those which, but for his unhappy bereavement, would have been his. And this we effect through the board-
Opening Address, [December.

District Schools and Family Life compared.

Turn now to the artificial system, as applied to the children of the state; and let us take it at its best, as it is to be found in the district schools, incomparably superior as these are in many respects to the ordinary workhouse school. Here the child is one small element in a great machine, without special relation to individuals, with surroundings utterly unlike those of the outward world of real life, with enforced uniformity carried into every daily detail, the whole mass moving mechanically to the word of command, without even the cultivation of resources arising from difficulties and deficient appliances, without the development of the sense of the real world and the condition and relations of real persons which the life of the cottager brings with it. The scholastic training is admittedly excellent; neatness, order, and discipline, are everywhere apparent; visitors are impressed by the magnitude and the perfect appliances of these establishments; but the question remains—are the individual natures of the children happily affected and healthily developed? Are they fitted to struggle with the difficult and encounter the temptations of after life? That such a result is attained seems certainly improbable a priori. When we seek to test the matter by observation, the task of tracing the pupils is so difficult that perfect satisfaction can scarcely be obtained. It is, however, stated in so many quarters that it is difficult to doubt it, that the pupils of these, as of all pauper schools, exhibit, taken in the mass, special mental defects and vices of character—that they are found to be spiritless, apathetic, and deficient in energy—grave faults in those who have to work their own way—that they are untruthful, and that the girls in particular are apt to be hard, coarse, and sullen in temper. Now, these are precisely the evil qualities which the manner of their rearing might be expected to generate. As to the frequency of grave lapses, especially of girls, in after life, there is much strong assertion on both sides; and Mr. Tufnell labours to show that Mrs. Senior's very unfavourable conclusions on this subject are too largely founded on hearsay. Further investigation is no doubt desirable; but as it never smokes but there is fire, I think there is great reason for uneasiness from the amount of concurrent testimony on the part of different observers tending to show that the serious failures are numerous.

Workhouse Schools and Family Life compared.

It is important for us in Ireland who have no district schools (though they were at one time attempted here, and may be attempted again) to observe that Mr. Tufnell's defence extends only to them, and that he admits fully what is said of the ill effects of rearing in workhouse

* From a good letter on Pauper Children, by Mr. William Tallack, in The Globe of 20th September, 1875.
schools. Mrs. Senior had said in her report: "The Governor of a large prison writes . . . that girls brought up at pauper schools are the worst prisoners by far of any that come under his care." "I have no doubt," says Mr. Tufnell, "that the Governor meant workhouse schools only, if he incidently used the wider term 'paupers.' The complaint of the Governor as regards workhouse schools is perfectly correct . . . but as regards district and separate schools it is utterly untrue."

The strong prejudice, as Mr. Tufnell chooses to call it, generally existing against even the district schools, interferes, he tells us, with the success of the pupils. So much is this the case that he himself dissuades wealthy persons who keep many servants from taking girls out of the schools, because they would probably "get so snubbed by the higher servants as workhouse girls, that they would be made perfectly miserable." This is an argument in favour of a mode of rearing, which would not affix upon the children the fatal workhouse stamp.

Through the schools, besides, is constantly passing, as I have said, a stream of casual children whose parents have been admitted to the workhouse, and the influence of intercourse with these must be injurious to the permanent children. With what I must call singular inconsistency, Mr. Tufnell, whilst strongly protesting against any degree of intermixture or contact of the juvenile paupers with the adults, on the ground that the latter are "morally infected," is yet in favor of mixing the permanent children with the casuals, whom a fellow-Inspector* characterizes as "morally tainted." When a chaplain advocates the same policy, quoting as applicable to the case the words of the Gospel, "Let both grow together until the harvest," I cannot but ask,—Would he think it necessary, in obedience to that precept, to subject his own children to the contaminating influence of evil association? The casual children are indeed deserving of the earnest solicitude of the state, and ought to be treated no less carefully, by methods appropriate to their circumstances, on a plan, as Mrs. Senior suggests, similar to that of the reformatories. But I hold that the permanent children—the orphans and deserted—instead of being thrown at random into an admittedly corrupt and corrupting medium, should be kept apart, and diffused amidst the morally sound and healthy mass of extern society.

**Extent to which the Boarding-out system is in operation in various countries.**

When we turn from general considerations to inquire into the actual working of the boarding-out system, we are surprised, if we have not previously studied the subject, to find for what a length of time and over how large an area it has been in operation. It has existed in France for centuries, and the enfants assistés of Paris appear to be successfully dealt with on this plan by the public department popularly known as the Bureau Ste. Apolline. The orphanage, founded in 1856 under the patronage of the Prince Imperial, is con-

---

*Mr. Browne. See Miss Smedley's *Boarding-out and Pauper Schools*, p. 244*
ducted entirely on the same method. More than 1,500 orphans of Berlin are boarded out in cottages through the province of Brandenburg. The same method is pursued in Hamburg; and there exists in Rhenish Prussia a Society "for the education of poor abandoned and neglected children in Christian families." The children of the Foundling Hospital of St. Petersburg are placed by that institution in peasant families in the rural districts. In America, the New York Juvenile Asylum and the Children's Aid Society of the same city, transfer their wards as soon as possible to private families in the agricultural districts; and since the commencement of the Civil War, has sprung up, also in New York, a new institution—the Howard Mission—which is carrying out the same system on the great scale. The Association presided over by Miss Schuyler has also pronounced emphatically in favour of the family system. One of the latest examples of its adoption is reported from South Australia; so that we might almost say that it has made the tour of the world. In all these cases it appears, when worked on right principles and with the necessary guarantees, to have produced good results, and satisfied the benevolent persons who have brought it into operation. I have been able merely to mention the facts in the most general way. I wish I could induce all my hearers—especially the ladies who have honoured us with their presence this evening—to study the excellent little book from which I have derived these materials—*The Children of the State,* by Miss Florence Hill. They will there find the facts attested by adequate evidence, and the whole subject of the management of this class treated not only with the noblest and most delicate feeling, but with admirable good sense and balance of judgment. Indeed, I cannot refrain from saying, that after having gone through much of what has been written by women on this subject, which they have made peculiarly their own, it is my decided opinion that their principal antagonist, Mr. Tufnell, exhibits in his Report more one-sidedness and less of the judicial temper than is to be found in their writings.

*Extent of Boarding-out in Scotland.*

But coming nearer home, let us see how far the boarding-out system has been tried in the sister countries. In Scotland it has long been in operation. About twenty-seven years ago the Board of the Edinburgh Orphan Hospital, dissatisfied with the results attained by that institution, resolved, both on sanitary and moral grounds, to place the children in country families. In an able Report by Mr. Greig, Clerk to the Edinburgh Parochial Board, which is one of the most important documents relating to the subject, it is stated that the plan has been followed by all the larger parishes in Scotland; the numbers placed out at present by the parishes of Edinburgh and Leith being upwards of 700, by Glasgow somewhat more, and by Dundee, Aberdeen, and other towns, in proportion to their population. Indeed, it appears that in Glasgow the system has been pursued for upwards of one hundred years. The Edinburgh and Glasgow

---

Boards are well satisfied with its results; and independent Scotchmen of high position and great intelligence bear a favourable testimony to its working. Mr. Tufnell endeavours to break the force of these facts by general representations as to the prevalence and alleged evil consequences of out-door relief in Scotland. But I must be permitted to say that I think Scotchmen are likely to know their own business best; sentimental weakness has never been regarded as a characteristic of that nation; and when I find the Boards I have mentioned convinced by experience that the plan is a good one, and such practical men as William Chambers and Sheriff Watson, of Aberdeen, approving its operation, I shall require very conclusive evidence to satisfy me that it is a failure.

Boarding-out in England.

In England the system has been tried in a good many localities by beneficent persons; and boards of guardians have been induced to co-operate with them in carrying it out. The most noteworthy cases of this kind are those of Mrs. Archer in the Highworth and Swindon Union, of the Rev. Mr. Armitstead at Sandbach in Cheshire, and of Miss Boucherett in Lincolnshire. A very judicious paper from the pen of the last-named lady, containing her experience of the results, will be found in Miss Florence Hill's little work. I have not before me evidence as to the number of English unions that have adopted the system; but attention has been aroused by several strong manifestations in its favour on the part of particular boards. The Highworth Union, in 1865, stated that they had observed with very great regret that the orphan pauper girls who had been brought up in the work-house, had, as a rule, turned out badly; and, that after giving the subject a great deal of thought and consideration, they had unanimously determined to give out-door relief to orphan girls, in cases where respectable cottagers could be found to take charge of them. But the most remarkable case is that of the Eton Union. Mr. Tufnell, in his Report for 1862, described the school of that Union as admirable in every respect, and its pupils were highly successful as candidates for prizes offered by a diocesan association; yet, as Mr. Tufnell himself tells us, notwithstanding this fair exterior, the school on close examination was found to be in such a condition that with his full concurrence it was broken up by the guardians, and the pupils sent to the Central District London School. It was ascertained, indeed, before taking the step, that of servants and apprentices who had been placed out from the school during four years, more than 40 per cent. had turned out ill. The guardians, however, on trying the district school, were still dissatisfied. The cost of the children was doubled, while their health was found not to be good, and the training was not of the kind adapted to prepare them for after life. In a remarkable paper, which must remain one of the principal pièces of this controversy, they stated, much as I have already done, the objections to this system of training. They adopted the course of boarding out the children in respectable cottages, and both School Committee and Board of Guardians entertain the conviction that this
system is greatly to be preferred, both to the old work-house school, and to the district schools.

*Extent of Boarding-out in Ireland.*

Coming now to the case of Ireland, we have to inquire how far the system has been adopted here, and with what results. It is now, I believe, universally known that the Protestant Orphan Societies in this country, both the parent institution in Dublin, and most, if not all, of the thirty-four branch ones which have sprung up in the provinces, manage their children on this plan. I have had before me the Forty-sixth Annual Report of the parent society. The number of the children under its care on the 28th of January in the present year was 349, and since its establishment, 2,280 children have been in its charge. Of these, 1,926 have been apprenticed, or otherwise provided for. By all the societies taken together, 2,587 orphans are now supported; and 10,295 have been apprenticed or otherwise provided for. The success of these societies is unquestioned, and is to me the standing and conclusive evidence that, in spite of all allegation to the contrary, the boarding-out system, if properly worked, can be carried out effectively, and made to produce the happiest results.

The Irish Local Government Board published, in their Report for 1873, statements from their Inspectors, as to the boarding-out unions in this country, and the results of the system. Most persons will probably be content with reading the brief summary which the Board give in their own Report, without studying the statements of the Inspectors on which that summary professes to be founded. It is therefore with much regret that I find in the Report a singular error as to matter of fact, which has probably led many to under-estimate the amount of acceptance which the boarding-out system has met with in Ireland. The error has, no doubt, arisen from the defective arithmetic of a subordinate; but it is much to be lamented that it should occur in a Report of the most important of Irish Administrative Boards, especially when the question on which it bears is still *sub judice.* The Board say: "It appears from the reports of the Inspectors that the system is adopted only in a minority of the Irish unions." Now what is the fact? There were at nurse, according to the reports of the Inspectors, in January, 1873, 1,542 children, and these children belonged to 92 different unions; the total number of unions is 163; hence, the unions in which there were no children boarded out in January, 1873, were only 71; so that the system is adopted by a majority of 21 unions out of 163.

But this result would give no adequate idea of the extent to which the system has been approved in Ireland. To form a fair judgment on this point, Boards of Guardians must not be counted only—they must also be weighed. Now, if we estimate the importance of unions in the Poor Law system by the numbers of persons relieved in them respectively in the year ending on the 29th of September, 1873, we shall find that the unions from which the 1,542 children were boarded out, relieved 230,937 persons, whilst the unions from which none
were boarded out, relieved only 89,305.* But without insisting on an arithmetical comparison of this kind, it is enough to say that amongst these unions were the two metropolitan, and those of Cork, Belfast, Limerick, Waterford, Kilkenny, Drogheda, Londonderry, Dundalk, Newry, Carlow, Lisburn, Lurgan, New Ross—the list thus comprising all the large towns with the single exception of Galway, and most of the centres of wealth, enterprise, and intelligence. It is interesting to observe that the system has been adopted by all the Wicklow unions, whose guardians have long had the opportunity of watching its operation in their neighbourhood under the auspices of the Protestant Orphan Society.

Working of the Boarding-out system in Ireland.

I do not think the Irish Local Government Board do justice to the working of the system as described in the Inspectors' Reports. They remark generally that "there is much difference of practice in the unions, according as more or less attention is paid by the boards of guardians to the selection of the foster-parents, and to the supervision of the children boarded out;" and they then advert particularly to a case of grievous neglect in the Sligo union. But they are entirely silent with respect to the favourable testimonies of several of the Inspectors. Mr. Robinson, in the metropolitan district, where the system is most largely adopted, says:—"The reports are in general satisfactory as to the health and appearance of the children, the state of their clothing, and the condition of the nurses' houses." In this district the education of the children is provided for:—"The children who are of an age to do so, attend school, and the guardians pay school fees;" "more than 60 per cent. of those now at nurse are on school rolls." Dr. Burke states that "so far as he can learn and personally observe, the system is carried out with fair advantage and benefit to its recipients generally." Dr. Brodie says:—"So far as I can judge, from what I have seen and otherwise learned, the results have been fairly satisfactory." Mr. Horsley, after remarking on the very moderate rate of mortality among the children, says:—"It is greatly to be regretted that Boards of Guardians do not, whenever it may be practicable, put out to nurse all orphans and deserted children, as I believe it is universally admitted that good nursing, care, pure air, and freedom of action, such as are not easily procurable in any workhouse, however well regulated, are necessary towards promoting the health and development of that class of children, and towards securing a probability of their growing up to be men and women, and useful citizens." Mr. W. J. Hamilton has "always been disposed to regard the system with favour, but has nevertheless felt apprehension about it, because of the dependence which must be placed on others, and the impossibility of such personal supervision as he would wish where such a helpless class is concerned." Mr. R. Hamilton gives detailed

* See Appendix. The total number of persons relieved in Ireland in the year ending 29th Sept., 1873, amounted to 320,242—not, as it is made by an erroneous addition in the Report of the Board, 319,242.
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statements as to the management of the system in the several unions in his district, commending in particular the guardians of the Strabane union; but does not express any general opinion of the results. Mr. Bourke names four unions in which the system "is working very satisfactorily," and says, "the practice might with advantage be considerably extended." Dr. King gives no opinion on the general merits of the system; he recommends, indeed, that the children should not be given out as boarders after three years of age, but not, so far as I can understand him, for any reasons founded on his own observations as Inspector. I may remark in passing that the Protestant Orphan Society receives children for boarding out up to the age of nine. Mr. O'Brien gives a measured verdict; he thinks the system is not sufficiently tried to enable us to decide between it and the work-house system for the rearing of orphans and deserted children. "So far," he says, "as I have had the means of judging of it, the new system appears to me to be very much a mixed one of good and evil. When the persons entrusted with the charge of the children have been selected with care and judgment, and a strict practical supervision has been subsequently maintained over them, I have no doubt much good has in numerous instances been effected. But when these conditions have been disregarded—as it is to be feared they too often have been—I am satisfied that the children would have been in every way better and more happily placed in a well-ordered workhouse." The only Inspector who makes a decidedly unfavourable report is Dr. Roughan. Having visited, he says, nearly all the twenty-two children in his district, and carefully observed their physical, moral, and mental condition, he has no hesitation in stating it as his opinion, that one and all would be much better off if reared in their respective workhouses, where they would be taught habits of order and cleanliness, good behaviour, and decorous conduct. This report led to an official correspondence and special inquiry, which disclosed grave abuses in the Sligo Union, a most improper selection of localities and families for the placing of the boarded-out children, and an utter absence of the due precautions for supervision.

How to guard the Boarding-out system from abuse.

On the whole, the impression which the examination of the reports of the Inspectors has made upon my mind is this: I am not at all shaken in my belief that those who are urging the adoption of the boarding-out system for orphans and deserted children are moving in the right direction, and that this will be found to be the true solution of the question how to deal with these children. But I am by no means satisfied with the precautions taken to guard it from abuse, and to secure its beneficial operation. And here, I think, is another case for the intervention of independent non-official workers. The

* I must protest against the one-sided way in which Mr. Tufnell, in his Observations, deals with these Reports of the Irish Inspectors. He quotes from them three sentences referring to cases of mismanagement; but does not give the slightest intimation that they contain any evidence favourable to the Boarding-out system.
assistance of the clergy of the several Churches might most usefully be brought into play. But it is in the action of women that, in my opinion, the really effective supplement of state organization is to be found. It is by the supervision of ladies of good position, and held in high esteem in their several localities, that the system can best be regulated and guarded from abuse. They can give the most discriminating and trustworthy counsel as to the selection of homes. They can deal with the young, and particularly with girls, incomparably better than men. They find their way with acceptance into the interior of households, where men could scarcely enter without feeling, as well as creating in others, a sense of intrusion. By manifesting a watchful interest in the few orphans they would take under their regular and personal supervision, they would make the little creatures of more consequence in the eyes of the foster-parents and their neighbours; they would at the same time brighten and improve the children's natures by giving them the consciousness that they were the objects of individual care; and, when the objects of this care were found worthy, they could assist in procuring them such employments as they were competent to fill, and could exercise a general friendly surveillance over them after they had passed out of official guardianship.

It is to be observed that the English Local Government Board makes it a condition of allowing children to be boarded out beyond the limits of the union to which they belong, that satisfactory arrangements should be made with a local committee for finding them homes, and regularly visiting them there. And as the Order on this subject was issued in consequence of a memorial addressed to the Board by ladies, it is plain that supervision by ladies was specially contemplated.

If then, the system is to be worked with beneficial results, this is the prime agency which must be brought to bear upon it; and I respectfully invite the high-minded and public-spirited ladies of this country to form a systematic organization, by which, wherever these orphans are placed, there will be kind hearts and wise heads to watch over them, to see that justice is done them, and to draw them, so far as the mild constraint of a powerful moral influence can do it, to habits of industry, honesty, and purity.

Neglect of Education of Boarded-out children in Ireland.

In the Reports of the Irish Inspectors, to which I have already referred, painful facts are mentioned, revealing the gross neglect of the education of these children which prevails in some quarters. In six of the unions in Mr. W. J. Hamilton’s district, the allowance by the guardians for the school fees of the children was nil. In Dr. Roughan’s district, that western region which on Education Maps is delineated in darker colours than any other part of our island, “a few of the elder children went to school occasionally.” Even in Londonderry, and, it is to be feared, in other northern unions of which nothing is distinctly stated, there was no allowance for education. Similar neglect is mentioned by Mr O’Brien, and is implied by Mr. Bourke. But, strange to say, general as is this complaint, I do not find in the Report of the Local Government
Board one word of censure respecting the neglect, nor is there any evidence of remonstrances being addressed by that Board to the several unions. Yet, not only is the enforcement of regular attendance at school necessary to give the child a fair chance of working his way in after life, but the fact of his coming daily under the eye of the schoolmaster or mistress would form an additional security for his proper clothing, his adequate nourishment, and the care of his health. The teacher should be required to fill a schedule, marking every absence, with the reason given to account for it, and indicating the progress of the pupil in the several subjects of instruction.

Present Attitude of the English Local Government Board on the Boarding-out Question.

Mr. Tufnell, at the close of his paper in reply to Mrs. Senior, advises the English Local Government Board to suppress the practice of boarding-out children. This advice is, in my opinion, extremely ill-judged. I believe, indeed, that it would be found impossible to carry into effect such a violent and arbitrary policy. There is, however, happily little danger of the attempt being made. The recommendation has not, properly speaking, an official character. Mr. Tufnell, when making it, had already resigned his office of school inspector, and Mr. Sclater-Booth, the present President of the Local Government Board, takes a much more reasonable view of the matter. In his conference with the deputation headed by Earl de la Warr, which waited on him in December last,* for the purpose of urging upon him the merits of the system, though he had at the time read Mr. Tufnell's "Observations," he gave it to be understood that, the guardians being free to adopt this method of rearing the children of the state, and it being proved that it was a cheaper method than the rival one, it would be left to work itself into notice and favour, if it could, by its own merits, alike without artificial stimulus and without governmental discouragement. This is, I think, all that is essential at the present stage of the movement—that the system should be regarded as one of the recognized and legitimate modes of dealing with the children, its general adoption being left to be brought about gradually by argument and experience. If legislation on the Poor Laws should be attempted in the next session of Parliament, it ought not, I think, to go beyond maintaining this impartial attitude. But the favourers of the system, in both countries alike, have a right to demand that whilst it is thus legally sanctioned, the action of the Local Government Boards should not be directed to discountenance and defeat it, but that the authorities of that department should apply themselves, whenever the guardians adopt it, to have it carried out in the right way, and with the proper guarantees for its beneficial working.

Necessity of Legislation on Boarding-out in Ireland to remove statutory limitation of age to Ten years.

With respect to Ireland, however, it will be necessary to obtain an extension of the age to which children may be boarded out. That

* See Morning Advertiser of 28th November, 1874.
age is now fixed at ten; but the natural period is fourteen—"the old
limit of guardianship by nurture and the old commencement of ap-
prenticeship." Till twenty-one, indeed, a modified tutelage should,
as in France, be exercised by the State; it should, under special cir-
cumstances, afford protection and shelter to its wards, and retain a
certain amount of control over them. Fourteen is the very earliest
age at which the regular boarding-out should terminate. But Irish
Boards of Guardians should have the power now possessed by Eng-
lish Boards, of keeping the children out to the age of sixteen.
The great object should be never to remove them to the work-
house, but to apprentice them to tradesmen, place them in domestic
service, or hand them over to relations—in fact, in some way or other
to merge them in the respectable working population. They might
in many cases be usefully transferred to temporary Homes on a small
scale, in which industrial training might be given them for a year
or two to fit them better for their future occupations. By arrange-
ments of this kind, the money of the ratepayers would, in the long
run, be really saved; for this is one of the cases where it is possible
to be penny wise and pound foolish.

Alleged policy of the Legislature on the Boarding-out Question.
The Irish Local Government Board of 1873 reiterate an opinion
expressed by a previous Board, that "whenever a child is sent out
of the workhouse, not at a tender age, and for the purpose of pre-
serving health, but at an age when any risk in that respect has ceas-
ed, and for the purpose merely of being brought up in a family in
stead of the workhouse school, the power given to boards of guardians
by the legislature has been perverted to an injurious instead of a
beneficent end, and the true intention of the legislature not faith-
fully carried out." Thus, whilst numerous English and Scotch
Boards of Guardians, and men and women of great weight and ex-
perience, have held that workhouses are utterly unfit places for the
rearing of the young, and that the family system ought to be prefer-
red for moral no less than physical reasons, Irish boards are not to
be permitted to entertain the same view, and, if they do entertain
and act on it, though they are within the law in doing so, they are
denounced by the Local Government Board as perverting their pow-
er to injurious ends.

But we are told that the intention of the legislature in sanctioning
the boarding out system in Ireland was only to provide against the
mortality incidental to infant children reared without mothers in the
workhouse. This intention is inferred from the preamble to a sec-
tion of the first act passed in relation to the subject in 1862; and
the inference is pressed by the Board of 1873, when the section had
been repealed and the preamble which introduced it erased from
the statute book.

Let us see what is the view of the reasons on which the practice
of boarding-out is founded, taken by the English Local Government
Board.
The Order of the English Board of 1870, enabling orphans and
deserted children to be boarded out beyond the limits of their re-
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spective unions, was issued, as I have already mentioned, in con-
sequence of an application to them from a number of ladies. How
does the memorial of these ladies begin? "That the system of edu-
cating orphans and deserted pauper children, and more especially
girls, in large schools—massing several hundreds together under
the same roof—be as far as possible discontinued, as its results have been
unsatisfactory, and much money has been thereby wasted." Not a
word here, be it observed, or in the entire document, about infant
mortality. How does the memorial close? "We beg your honour-
able board to consider that our endeavours may be the means of
rescuing thousands of children"—from what?—"from an unnatural,
sad, useless, and unhealthy life, and of adding a large number of
useful servants and able working people to the community." Here,
surely, the moral and social reasons greatly predominate over the
sanitary, and the danger to infant life in particular does not seem
once to cross the minds of the memorialists.

The Board complied with the prayer thus addressed to them, and,
in the Order which they issued, the rule is laid down:—"No child
shall be first boarded out at an earlier age than two or at a later age
than ten." That is to say, children are permitted to be first boarded
out up to the age at which in Ireland the boarding out must cease.
And how do the English Board explain the meaning and motives
of their own order in the circular letter transmitting it to the
unions to which it was issued? Here are their words:

"With regard to the ordinary work-house schools, the difficulties are so great
that the best efforts of boards of guardians to render them efficient are often de-
feated Imperfect classification, incomplete separation from the adult inmates,
the associations inseparable from the work-house, and the circumstance that or-
phans who may be unfortunately thrown out of employment a few years after
leaving the workhouse, invariably look upon it as their natural home where they
have left their friends and acquaintances, the fluctuating terms for which the
children are admitted, and the smaller competition for the post of schoolmaster
and mistress in work-house as compared with other schools, constitute difficulties
of too formidable a character, both in social and educational respects, to justify
any preference for the system, if any other practice should appear to offer reason-
able chances of success."

Then, after pointing out the partial advantages and countervailing
disadvantages of the district schools—amongst the latter being the
deadening monotony of the life in them, the absence of domestic ties,
and the want of a home to fall back upon in trouble in after life—
they proceed as follows:

"The boarding-out system aims at solving the problem in a different direction,
and while inferior as an agency for intellectual education, it may possibly secure
many other advantages of a very high order, both to the children themselves and
to the community, by replacing the children, to a certain extent, in that family
life, from which it is a calamity for them to be entirely excluded. It is further
urged in the strongest manner, by the advocates of the boarding-out system,
that it tends to merge the pauper children, to whom it is applied, in the general
body of the population, and if this result can generally be achieved, no more
powerful argument can be adduced in favor of the scheme."

Now, the orders of the English Board are acts of delegated legis-
lative power, every exercise of which, in the shape of a General
Order, it is their duty to include as part of their proceedings in their
annual report to Parliament. When a full year has elapsed, these Orders, if unquestioned by legislation or discussion in Parliament, must be taken as tacitly sanctioned, and therefore expressing the mind of the legislature. What, then, is the opinion of Parliament? Is it that in Ireland there are no moral reasons for boarding out—no reasons but those founded on infant mortality. If so, we arrive at the conclusion that in matters involving no political considerations, but dealing altogether with such a question of individual human well-being as the proper rearing of a child, Parliament has one view for the eastern, and another for the western side of St. George's Channel. This opinion of Parliament, which Irish guardians are censured for contravening, is a mere figment; and the existing legal inequality between Ireland and England, as to the age to which children may be boarded out, is simply one of the many results of the inveterate habit of legislating for the two countries not simultaneously, but separately.

It will have been observed that the Irish Board stated in 1873 that at the age of five any risk to health in the work-house has ceased. Where are the statistics on which this assertion is based? Can it be shown that the mortality of children in Irish work-houses, between the ages of five and fourteen, is not above the average for the country at large? In a paper read before this society by Dr. Hancock, in 1862, it was shown from the statistics collected by the Irish Poor Law Commissioners of 1859, that, taking all the workhouses in Ireland together, whilst the mortality of children under two was then three and a-half times the average rate, the mortality of the children between two and fifteen was nearly three times the average rate. His reasoning has not, so far as I am aware, ever been refuted. What, then, is the meaning of the statement that it is only in the earliest stages of juvenile life that there is danger in the workhouse? Let there be an analysis of the mortality in the workhouses at the different ages between two and fifteen, and let the assertion of immunity from risk after five be so established, if it can. But at present the whole evidence is against it. In Mr. Horsley's report of 1873, to which I have already referred, he says: "In Tralee Union, where the guardians have hitherto always declined to put out orphans and deserted children to nurse, the result has been that forty-six out of forty-seven children of those classes admitted to the work-house between 1862 and the 31st of December, 1872, have died." When such a startling fact as this comes to light, it is high time that the whole subject should be cleared up, and the statistics made known which are relied on as justifying the apparently arbitrary selection of the age of five as the point at which risk ceases to exist.

Conclusion.

If the subject of the Poor-Laws should be taken up, as I have been anticipating, and as seems to be generally expected, with the view of comprehensive revision and amendment, other points besides those to which I have called your attention, will, of course, require to be considered. It will be necessary to place the working-classes throughout the United Kingdom in the same relation to the state with respect
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to the right to relief. An end must be put to the monstrous prac-
tice of deportation of Irish paupers from England and Scotland,
which every now and then calls forth a cry of disgust and indigna-
tion amongst us, and embitters Irish feeling against imperial legisla-
tion. And in connection with this practice, the whole subject of
settlement, or, more properly, of chargeability, will have to be placed
on a right footing. The question of the area of taxation for purposes
of local government will also have to be decided. Now, there is not
one of these subjects on which valuable discussions and suggestions
will not be found in the Transactions of our Society. In particular,
it is but justice to add, for the most important aid to the study of
each and all of them, we are indebted to Dr. Hancock, who in papers
read before us, and documents published in his official capacity, has,
in my opinion, done more to throw light on all the elements of the
Irish social life of our time than any other writer.

Dr. Hancock has not only deserved well of the public, by his
individual contributions to the study of social questions; he has also
the honour of having been the founder of the Statistical Society of
Ireland. Invited by him to co-operate in its formation, I have all
through its history followed its progress and observed its working.
Time, as it passes, has but confirmed my belief of the benefits it
is fitted to confer, and has actually conferred, on this country by
enlightening opinion, and thus ultimately contributing to shape
legislation. So long as it follows the wise policy it has hitherto
pursued—so long as it excludes from its discussions the disturb-
ing element of party politics—and treats the questions that come
before it in the scientific spirit, it will continue to do like good ser-
vice in the future, and will deserve the support of all right think-
ing and patriotic Irishmen.

APPENDIX.

92 Unions with Children boarded-out in January, 1873.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of children boarded out by each union in January, 1873.</th>
<th>No. of persons relieved by each union during year ending 29th September, 1873.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A) Mr Robinson's District.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dublin,</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>6,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dublin,</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>11,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athy,</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltinglass,</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlow,</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celbridge,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunshaughlm,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorey,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naas,</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navan,</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of children boarded out by each union in January, 1873</td>
<td>No of persons relieved by each union during year ending 29th September, 1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) <strong>Mr. Robinson's District.—con.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathdown,</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathdrum,</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shillelagh,</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim,</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) <strong>Dr. Brodie's District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballinasloe,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glennamaddy,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gort,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strokestown,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) <strong>Dr. King's District.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork,</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungarvan,</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilmaullock,</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroom,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallow,</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youghal,</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) <strong>Mr. O'Brien's District.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardee,</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balrothery,</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbridge,</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymena,</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast,</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drogheda,</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundalk,</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungannon,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larne,</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisburn,</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurgan,</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry,</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) <strong>Dr. Burke's District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailieborough,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymasheen,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrickmacross,</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleblayney,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavan,</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clones,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delvin,</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenderry,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longford,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountmellick,</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullingar,</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullamore,</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The report of the Inspector gives us only this total, not the number of children from each boarding-out union in the district.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of children boarded out by each union in January, 1873.</th>
<th>No. of persons relieved by each union during year ending 29th September, 1873.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F) Mr. Bourke's District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croom, ...</td>
<td>1,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennis, 8</td>
<td>1,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glin, 8</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick, 12</td>
<td>9,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenagh, 1</td>
<td>2,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathkeale, 9</td>
<td>2,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G) Mr. R. Hamilton's District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballymoney, 2</td>
<td>1,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlederg, 1</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clogher, 9</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donegal, 2</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenties, 2</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gortin, 3</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inishowen, 3</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvinestown, 7</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letterkenny, 1</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisnaskea, 9</td>
<td>1,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry, 13</td>
<td>2,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford, 8</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Limavady, 6</td>
<td>1,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omagh, 3</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabane, 14</td>
<td>2,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranorlar, 2</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H) Dr. Roughan's District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawnboy, ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromore West, 22*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killala, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sligo, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Mr W J. Hamilton's District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbeyleix, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callan, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaghmore, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilkenny, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilmacthomas, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ross, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomastown, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J) Mr. Horsley's District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahirciveen, 50*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castletown, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingle, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmanaway, 50*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanturk, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millstreet, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle, 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The report of the Inspector gives us only this total, not the number of children from each boarding-out union in the district.
Total of children boarded out in January, 1873, 1,542.
Total of persons relieved by the 92 boarding-out unions in year ending 29th September, 1873, 230,937.
Total of persons relieved by all the unions in same year, 320,242.

71 Unions from which no Children were boarded-out in January, 1873, arranged according to Inspectors' Districts.

(A) Enniscorthy, Wexford.
(B) Galway, Tuam, Loughrea, Portumna, Mountbellew, Oughterard, Clifden, Athlone, Parsonstown, Ballinrobe, Roscommon, Castlerea.
(C) Bandon, Clonakilty, Fermoy, Kinsale, Midleton, Mitchelstown.
(D) Armagh, Cookstown, Downpatrick, Kilkee, Magherafelt, Newtownards.
(E) Cootehill, Granard, Kells, Monaghan, Oldcastle.
(F) Ennistymon, Ballyvaughan, Corofin, Killaloe, Kilrush, Scariff, Tulla, Bornsokane, Roscrea.
(G) Enniskillen, Dunfanaghy, Ballyshannon, Coleraine, Ballycastle.
(H) Ballina, Carrick-on-Shannon, Castlebar, Manorhamilton, Mohill, Newport, Toghercurry, Swinford, Westport, Claremorris, Belmullet.
(I) Clonmel, Carrick-on-Suir, Cashel, Castlecomer, Clogheen, Thurles, Trerahan.
(J) Bantry, Kenmare, Killarney, Listowel, Skibbereen, Skull, Tralee.
Total relieved by these unions in year ending 1873, 89,305.

[Read, 16th November, 1875.]

Three out of the six ordinary meetings were devoted to the important subject of Local Government.

Mr. Joseph T. Pim read a paper on “Municipal Government and Taxation,” a matter of growing importance, having regard to the great increase of duties cast on municipal authorities and the large expenditure of money necessarily entrusted to them. The main suggestion of the paper was an equal division of taxation and representation between owners and occupiers.

Dr. Norwood took up another branch of the same subject in a paper on “Suggested Improvements in Private Bill Legislation.” He suggested that the judicial inquiries should be held in the several counties in Ireland before the county court judge, and that the investigation into the merits of the bill should be referred to the judges.

Dr. Hancock read a paper on “Scotch and Irish Local Government Compared,” which arose out of Mr. MacNeel Caird’s Essay on Scotland, in the Cobden Club Series. A valuable provision of the Scotch law for dealing with ruined houses in towns was, by Mr. Caird’s essay, brought under our notice. The fall of several houses in Dublin in the Autumn—in one case attended with loss of life—showed the importance of this provision; and the suggested extension of the law to Ireland has been taken into consideration by one of the committees of the Town Council, and has been by them referred to their law agent and engineer for report.