(3) REPORT UPON THE IMPORTANCE OF EXTENDING TO DUBLIN THE LONDON SYSTEM OF HAVING A COMMON FUND FOR METROPOLITAN UNIONS, FOR ALL EXPENDITURE IN WORKHOUSE RELIEF.

FROM some facts that have been brought under the notice of the Committee, they think it of importance to direct attention to the unsatisfactory position of Dublin for purposes of improved administration of poor relief, from having been divided into two unions, with distinct charges for workhouse and other relief.

In London the defect of having distinct areas of charge within the metropolis seems to have been first met by Mr. Villiers, under Lord Palmerston's administration, in the provisions of the "Metropolitan Houseless Poor Act, 1864," under which the system of casual wards has since been so successfully carried out. The principle of common charge was extended by Mr. Gathorne Hardy's Act of 1867, under Lord Derby's administration, for establishing a common poor fund for the London metropolitan district. The principle was further extended by subsequent enactments, especially by Mr. Goschen's Act under Mr. Gladstone's administration, for making all workhouse relief a common charge throughout London.

The Committee approve of this principle, which is now in full operation in London, and recommend its extension to Dublin, so that there should be only one fund for all workhouse relief in the

two Dublin Unions.

(4) Further Information as to the Proposal\* to extend the Scotch Law as to Improvements in Town Holdings, to Ireland.

THE want of this reform in small towns as well as large is shown by a case which happened at the Home Circuit at the Spring Assizes of the present year, 1876.

The case related to the Borough of Portarlington, where the Grand Jury has sole authority over roads and streets, as there are no Town Commissioners:—

## NOVEL APPLICATION.

"Mr. C. P. Hamilton said that he was instructed, on behalf of the Grand Jury, to ask his lordship's guidance under the following circumstances:—A house in the market square of Portarlington has long been in a most dangerous condition. It is uninhabited, and no owner can be found. The Castle authorities were appealed to, but they declined to interfere, stating, however, that the Constabulary would get orders to warn strangers to keep a safe distance from the premises.

"The JUDGE—I wonder where is the policeman to stand. (Laughter.) I cannot interfere. I have no power to order such a nuisance to be abated, and I shall not make any order or suggestion in the matter. If anyone is brought before me as a prisoner, I shall say what the law is;

not otherwise."

The circular of the Council of the Statistical Society sent in Feb-

<sup>\*</sup> See Report of Charity Organisation Committee, in February number of Journal, vol. vi., p. 540.