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.

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-

ruary, 1876, inviting Irish town authorities to co-operate in supporting the proposal to extend the Scotch law as to security for improvements in town-holdings to Ireland, has elicited from the Town Council of Belfast the following reply:—

"TOWN HALL, BELFAST, 
Town Clerk's Office, 1st March, 1876.

Sir,

"I am instructed by the Improvement Committee of the Town Council, to forward you the annexed copy of a resolution, passed by them at their last meeting.

"I am, your obedient servant,

"JAMES GUTHRIE, Town Clerk.

"To the Hon. Secretary of the
"Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland."

"A circular from the Hon. Secretary of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland, asking the council to co-operate in an extension of the Scotch laws relating to ruined houses in towns, to Ireland, having been read:—

"Resolved—that the secretary be informed the members for the borough will be requested to co-operate in any proposition to extend such law to Ireland."

The Town Council of Dublin subsequently passed a similar resolution, and decided on introducing provisions in the Dublin Improvement Bill.

As to the exact details of the Scotch law on the subject, the Statistical Society have, through the courtesy of Mr. MacNeil Caired, been favoured with a copy of the Scotch Act of 1663, which for two centuries and upwards has been in force in the eighty Royal Burghs, including all the chief towns of Scotland.

(SCOTCH ACT, 1663; c. 12, CAR II.)

12 Act anent ruinous houses in Royal Burghs.

"Our Sovereign Lord being informed, that upon the high streets of several of His Majesties Burghs Royal, and in the vennels and other passages within the same, there be many houses in the publick view of all people resorting thereto, very ruinous, and not inhabited these divers years by-gone, nor likely to be repaired by any, to the great approby of the saids burghs, and common scandal of the kingdom, as being altogether defective of that policy and good order which is, and ever hath been, so earnestly intended in the many wholsom and laudable laws already made by his majesty and his royal progenitors of most worthy memory. And finding the burroughs very desirous to have these many dangers and inconveniences prevented and remedied, which the inhabitants of these burghs, and the rest of the lieges frequenting the same, do continually fear from such ruinous buildings, doth, therefore, with advice of his estates of parliament, ordain the provest and bailies of the burgh where such ruinous houses are, to cause, warn, and charge all persons, that have or pretends right to the property of such lands and buildings, or any annual rents forth thereof, to cause, build, and repair, in a decent way, within year and day, such houses and buildings as have been waste, and not inhabited three years before the date of this present act, or else to sell the same space of three years, or else to sell the same to others, to be builded within the same space of year and day: And to charge all known persons, personally or as their dwelling-place, and by open proclamation at the paroch-
kirk or mercat cross of the burgh; and all others by open proclamation at the said mercat cross and paroch-kirk; and in case of their absence out of this realm, at the cross of Edinburgh, and peer and shoar of Leith, upon three score days; with certification to them if they fail, the said provost and bailies shall cause the said lands and tenements to be valued by certain persons, to be chosen and sworn by them for that effect, and sell the same to any person that will buy them, and pay the price of the same to these owners, if they be known; and if they be not known, to consign the prices hereof in the hands of the provost, one of the bailies, or dean of gild of the said burgh, forthcoming to these who have interest thereto; and if no man will buy them, it shall be lawful to the said provost and bailies, after apprising thereof, as said is, and payment or consignation of the prices of the same, to cast down the said ruinous houses and cause build the same of new. And His Majesty, with advice foresaid, declares, that it shall not be lawful in time coming, to any manner of person to pursue them nor their successors therefore, nor pretend any right or interest thereto, but that the said right shall be a perfect security to the builders thereof and their successors.

The Statistical Society have also been favoured with Mr. MacNeel Caird’s explanation of the part of the Scotch law which rests on judicial decision and usage, which has grown up under the Act of 1663, above referred to. He says:—

“In Scotland the Act of 1663 applies to all Royal Burghs, eighty in number, some of them very small, and the Burgh magistrates, elected by the Town Council, who are elected by the inhabitants, and called the Provost and Bailies, are the parties empowered to sanction the proceedings and grant the necessary warrants.

“The power of a person having a limited or doubtful title, to obtain authority from the Dean of Guild, to execute improvements on houses in Royal Burghs, and to charge the cost on the property, is not statutory, but has grown up by usage, and effects an incumbrance equivalent to a mortgage. The Dean Guild is one of the Burgh magistrates.”

IV.—The Importance of Industrial Education. By Major H. L. Geary, R.A.

[Read, 27th June, 1876.]

In the course of some recent investigations which involved enquiry into the working and results of Reformatory and Industrial Schools, it seemed to me that the subject had not yet received the attention it merited, on the part of many interested in the solution of social problems—living beyond the circle of those immediately engaged in the working of such establishments. And it is in the conviction that the principle requires more extended application, in the interests of the honest labouring classes, that I venture to submit the contents of this paper for the consideration of the Society.

It is interesting to notice the value that was set in ancient times upon industrial or handicraft instruction. There is a text in the Vedas to the effect, “That he who does not teach his son a trade teaches him to be a thief.” In the days of the Jewish monarchy, if not amongst the Jews in the present day, every boy was taught a