subsist in the market between their values if gold were demonetised, and that which would subsist if silver were demonetised. If this ratio were in the former case 14, and in the latter case 17, it is clearly in the power of legislation to fix the ratio at $15\frac{1}{2}$.

But it may be said, that the union of all nations would be necessary for such legislation to succeed. I reply that the British Empire is a sufficiently large concern to act alone in the matter. I admit that the union of all nations would be desirable, and I believe that if we were to set the example it would be generally followed.

In order to avoid any interference with the letter of contracts, it would be necessary to provide that all debts now payable in gold should continue to be so. This would include the interest on the whole of our national debt, and on a great part of that of India.

In this paper, as its title indicates, I have given most prominence to that argument for bimetallism which is drawn from the peculiar relation between Great Britain and India. I have done so because it has not been dwelt on as it deserves. But there are equally strong arguments of a more general nature. The common example and experience of mankind are in favour of accepting gold and silver on an equality. I believe that bimetallism was the universal practice of the world until silver was demonetised by an Act of the British Parliament near the end of the last century.

Further, if gold money alone is right, it ought to be universal over the world, in Asia as well as Europe and North America. But the introduction of exclusively gold money into India—and still more, into both India and China—is impossible, for the reason that the world is not able to find gold enough to replace the silver money of India alone. Unless new sources of gold are discovered to an extent which we have no reason whatever to expect, the supply, so far from being sufficient for Asia, will be insufficient for the wants of Europe and America, unless they return to the ancient, natural, rational, and safe system of accepting both the precious metals alike.

IV.—*On the Anomalous Differences in the Poor-laws of Ireland and of England with reference to Outdoor Relief, Area of Taxation, etc.* By Abraham Shackleton, J.P., T.C.

The paper I am about to read possesses no claim to originality. I have merely put together the conclusions arrived at by a few gentlemen interested in the question of poor relief, who met and considered some points connected therewith, with a view to their being discussed at this Congress. The views which I now bring before you, have already on many previous occasions been more comprehensively placed before my fellow-citizens.

As long ago as 1863, by Professor Ingram, who in his Address to the Statistical Society, recommended that Irish Boards of Guardians and the Irish Local Government Board should be armed with the same powers, and charged with the same duties as the English authorities.

In 1873, by Mr. William Graham Brooke who pointed out the defects of the Irish Poor-law, as compared with the English, as affecting the protection of women and children, and recommended the complete assimilation of the Irish and English Poor-laws.

In 1880, by Dr. Hancock, who in an Address to the Trades' Union Congress, at its meeting in Dublin, recommended Union Rating, Metropolitan Common Poor Fund, and a complete extension to Irish Boards of Guardians of the powers and duties allotted to English Boards of Guardians.

Professor Ingram in his address to the Statistical Society of Ireland just referred to, gave expression to the following sentiments which are as true now as then, but which after a lapse of eighteen years have unfortunately not yet been reduced to practice by the overworked Parliament of the United Kingom:—

> "The regulations of a poor-law ought to be founded either on the facts of individual human nature, or on the relations and mutual duties of the members of a human family. Those facts are the same in Ireland as in England; these relations are alike sacred on both sides of the channel. Whether aged couples should be separated in a workhouse—whether widows with one child, or widows with two, ought to have outdoor relief—whether deserted wives should be placed in the same position as widows—whether the wives of soldiers and sailors in Her Majesty's service are entitled to any special consideration—whether the occupation of a quarter acre of land should exclude from outdoor relief—these questions which, if decided by reason, and not either by prejudice or by haphazard, must, I think, be answered alike, whether proposed in the one country or in the other.
>
> "What is now, above all things, to be desired with respect to the poor-laws, is that the same discretionary powers vested in the English Poor-law Board should be confided to the Irish Commissioners. *Whatever may be our opinions as to the extent to which outdoor relief ought now to be given in Ireland,* the same power of authorizing it, whenever and wherever circumstances may require it, ought to belong to the central authorities in both countries."

The Famine in Ireland in 1846-47 led to a modification of the Irish Poor-law and the abandonment, under certain circumstances, of the exclusive workhouse system, which had been established by the Irish Poor Relief Act of 1838. This was effected by the passing of the Irish Poor Relief Extension Act (10 & 11 Vic. c. 31). The distress in 1860-'1-'2-'3 led to further modifications of the Irish Poor-law; and the distress in 1879-80 made it necessary to suspend for a time the restrictions upon outdoor relief, a considerable portion of the time of Parliament being occupied in both the short sessions of 1880 in temporarily suspending the restrictions of the Irish Poor-law. These suspensions were necessarily made by statute, as the Irish Local Government Board is not entrusted with the power possessed by the English Local Government Board to modify the restrictions on outdoor relief. The principle of exclusive workhouse relief which had been proposed in 1835, was never actually adopted in England; and the guardians, consequently, had large discretion as to the mode of administering relief to the poor. This matter having been dealt with in 1844 with regard to a large part of England, was finally dealt with for the rest of England in 1852 by an order of the English Poor-law Board made in that year, signed by Mr. Spencer Walpole, Sir John Trollope, and Earl Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli. Under that order the guardians have power to give relief to able-bodied persons under the following conditions:—

That (see Article 5)

> "No relief shall be given to any able-bodied male person while he is employed for wages or other hire or remuneration by any person."

That (see Article 6)

"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."

That (see Article 7)

"Provided that the regulations in Articles 5 and 6 shall not be imperative in the following cases:—

"1st. The case of a person relieving relief on account of sudden and urgent necessity.

"2nd. 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.

"3rd, The case of a person receiving relief for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the burial of any of his family.

"4th, The case of the wife, child, or children of a person confined in any gaol or place of safe cnstody.

"5th. The case of the wife, child, or children, resident within the parish or union, of a person not residing therein."

That (see Article 8)

"The Guardians shall, within thirty days after they shall have proceeded to act in execution of Art. 6, report to the Poor Law Board the place or places at which able-bodied male paupers shall be set to work, the sort or sorts of work in which they or any of them shall be employed, the times and mode of work, and the provision made for superintending them while working, and shall forthwith discontinue or alter the same, if the Poor Law Board shall so require."

That (see Article 10)

"If the Guardians shall, upon consideration of the special circumstances of any particular case, deem it expedient to depart from any of the Regulations hereinbefore contained (except those contained in Art. 3), and within twenty-one days after such departure shall report the same, and the grounds thereof, to the Poor-law Board, the relief which may have been so given in such case by such Guardians before an answer to such report shall have been returned by the said Board shall not be deemed to be contrary to the provisions of this Order; and if the Poor-law Board shall approve of such departure, and shall notify such approval to the Guardians, all relief given in such case after such notification, so far as the same shall be in accordance with the terms and conditions of such approval, shall be lawful, anything in this Order to the contrary notwithstanding."

I may here quote, in support of the English system, Mr. Bright, who speaking on the impolicy of restrictions on guardians in the administration of the poor laws, in allusion to the action of the President of the Poor-law Board in England during the crisis caused by the American war in the cotton industry in Manchester, said—

"I think he has shown that disposition which we should expect from him and the department over which he presides, to arm guardians in every district with powers to exercise a very wide discretion with regard to the treatment of this great evil.

"The guardians are elected by a very large constituency in every union; they are spending, not the money of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the money which their constituents have recently paid into their coffers, and I believe there is no body to whom you could more safely entrust the spending the ratepayers' money than those to whom the ratepayers have themselves entrusted it. I think, therefore, the Right Hon. President of the Poor-law Board will be acting in accordance with true wisdom, and with the true instinct of humanity, if he does little or nothing to check the liberality of the guardians in the distribution of the resources entrusted to their care."

Now, if this be a sound principle to act on, it follows that it is anomalous to give guardians of the poor in Ireland less powers, and to impose on them less duties in respect of the relief of the poor, than are allotted to guardians in England and Wales.

We have in Ireland a Local Government Board with a different constitution, with different powers, and different duties, to the English Local Government Board, and we have Boards of Guardians of the poor, also with different powers and different duties to what similar bodies in England possess.

It is difficult to see on what grounds the apparent distrust evinced by parliament of the Irish Local Government Board rests, which forces that board to appeal to parliament in emergencies, and for purposes in relation to which the English Board has full discretionary powers.

In the remarkable speech with which he closed his career as Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel said:—

> "There ought to be established between England and Ireland a complete equality in all civil, municipal, and political rights, so that no person viewing Ireland with perfectly disinterested eyes should be enabled to say a different law is enacted for Ireland, and *on account of some jealousy or suspicion* Ireland has curtailed and mutilated rights."

If the Irish Local Government Board had like powers, and had made a similar Order to that made by the English Local Government Board during the cotton crisis, the time of Parliament need not have been occupied, and no delay need have occurred when thenecessity arose in 1880. The provisions of the Act of 1880 only gave temporary powers to the Irish Local Government Board, which expired in March, 1881, so that should such an emergency now arise we should have to wait for the meeting of parliament, and then for the tedious forms of imperial legislation to evolve another temporary act. Moreover, as the migration of Irish to England has made such progress during the last half century, that one in seven of the adult population of Scotch towns, and one in fourteen of the adult population of English towns are now of Irish birth, we might reasonably conclude that the time had arrived when an assimilation of the Poor-laws throughout the United Kingdom ought to be carried out, in order that the labouring classes might feel they were under equally favourable laws as regards Poor Relief in every part of the British Isles.

I would, therefore, suggest that the Guardians of the Poor in Ireland ought to be entrusted with discretion as to relieving destitute persons, either in or out of the workhouse; subject only to restrictions similar to those contained in the English Poor-law Board's Order of 1852, and subject to such further restrictions as may be enforced in England, in all the Unions governed by the Order of 1852.

For want of this assimilation Ireland lost the benefit of the Lunacy Act of 1853, which provided for the care of all lunatics in England, and was left until 1868 under the law that prevailed in England from 1800 to 1838; and in 1868 she was only allowed the benefit of the law which had prevailed in England from 1838 to 1853. A bill was introduced by Lord O'Hagan ("The Lunacy Asylums' Bill") in 1879, and again in 1880, to remedy these defects; and in the present session, the "Lunacy Law Assimilation Bill" was introduced by Mr. Litton to effect the same object.

I would also suggest that the English law of 1853, which provides that lunatics shall be sent at once to asylums, and gives power to the Governors to board out harmless cases, as proposed by Mr. Litton's Bill, shall be extended to Ireland.

In 1865, by the "Union Chargeability Act," the principal expenses of the relief of distress in England were converted from parochial into

union charges. In 1876 a step was taken towards extending this reform to Ireland, by providing that the electoral division charge in respect to in-door relief expenses shall not exceed the average union charges by more than 50 per cent., *i.e.*, if the average union charges be 2s., it cannot exceed 3s. In Claremorris Union in 1880, the rate on Mayo Electoral Division was only 1s., while in Claremorris Electoral Division, it was 3s. 6d. Mr. Tuke, an English gentleman who visited Connaught during the distress of 1879, and has given much attention to the state of the distressed districts of Ireland, both in the late and former famines, points out the importance of substituting union for electoral rating in Ireland.

In the case of Scotland, a commencement was made of combining parishes for a Common Poor Fund in Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Dundee. The importance of extending the English principle of union rating to Scotland was advocated by Mr. MacNeel Caird in a paper before the British Association in Glasgow, in 1876, in the course of which he remarks:—

> "The field for a labouring man was therefore physically limited to narrow bounds round the place where he lived, and any arrangement which artificially increased his difficulty in obtaining a house in another district, where he could have steadier work and better wages, was a source of oppression to him. The law of settlement in narrow areas *had led to the pulling down of houses and the restriction of the accommodation of labourers in country parishes in Scotland*, and *one result of that was that nearly one-third of the whole people of Scotland lived in houses of one room.* That was a fact which required to be enforced on the legislature, in order that wider bounds of settlement might be adopted, *as had been done eleven years ago in England.*"

One consequence of the adoption of Union-rating in England, was the recommendation by the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Poor Removal in 1879, of the abolition of poor removal in England and Wales, except in the case of persons recently landed in seaport towns. The Scotch witnesses, however, were strongly opposed to a corresponding modification in Scotland of the law of poor removal, which is much more stringent than the English law had been. There is reason to believe that the prevalence of parochial rating in Scotland led to the Scotch opposition to have the measure which was proposed for England extended to Scotland, and this shows that the two questions of parochial rating and poor removal are intimately connected together.

I think we may assume that an important principle of Poor-law administration of this kind, which was recommended for Ireland by the statesmen who reformed the English Poor-law in 1835, and introduced the Irish Poor-law of 1838, and was applied so far back as 1865 to seven-tenths of the population of the United Kingdom, should now be fully acted upon, and that the remaining three-tenths residing in Ireland and Scotland should not be left in an exceptional position, and that the time has arrived when the principle of union rating should be adopted in Ireland and Scotland.

The consequent measure of terminating the power of removal ought also to be extended to Scotland, at least so far as the removal of persons of Irish birth in that country is concerned. In this way a termination would be put to a question that has been before Parliament for the last forty years, and has been made the subject of a recommendation of a select committee of the Commons so far back as 1846, and has also been the subject of strong recommendation by the Poor-law authorities in Ireland.

There are few questions connected with Poor-law administration which, by reason of the extremely hard cases that occur under the

existing law, bring into greater prominence the strange diversity of the Poor-law in the three countries, and enlist a greater amount of sympathy with those who suffer under the operation of the law.

About two years after the question of Union-rating was settled in England, the question arose of the desirability of forming a Common Poor Fund for the metropolitan districts of London. A commencement of such a scheme was made under Earl Beaconsfield's administration in 1867, and was completed under Mr. Gladstone's administration in 1870; a Common Poor Fund for a large part of the relief of the poor in the London metropolitan districts being thus established.

In Dublin the police-tax is levied off an extensive area which is sub-divided for Poor-law purposes between three different unions, and again sub-divided into the electoral divisions of those unions. While the tax for police is equal over this area, the tax for poor relief is very unequal, as may be seen by the following statistics of the poor rates in and near Dublin in the present year.

	s.	d.
North City, ...	2	8
South City, ...	2	0
Howth, ...	2	3
Coolock, ...	2	2
Finglas, Clondalkin, Tallaght, ...	2	0
Palmerston, Rathfarnham, and Whitechurch, ...	1	10
Clontarf and Drumcondra, ...	1	9
Donnybrook and Blanchardstown, ...	1	8
Glasnevin and Rathmichael, ...	1	7
Rathmines and Castleknock,...	1	6
Glencullen, ...	1	2
Powerscourt, ...	1	1
Kingstown, Killiney, Blackrock, Delgany, Dundrum,	1	0
Stillorgan, ...	0	11
Bray, ...	0	10

Every principle that induced the adoption of a Common Poor Fund for London appears to apply to the Dublin metropolitan district.

The system of tram cars and suburban railways so extensively developed in and around Dublin tends to carry the more wealthy of the population into the rural districts, and thus to throw the burden of poor relief upon the inhabitants of the poorer districts, who cannot, for obvious reasons, move their residences into an area of lower taxation. I am therefore disposed to think that the principle of the Common Poor Fund of the London metropolitan district ought to be applied to the three unions which have their workhouses in the Dublin Metropolitan Police District.

In all those parts of England and Wales which are not under School Boards, comprising about 9,000,000 of the population, the duty is cast on the guardians of rural districts to appoint school attendance committees to see that children attend schools; and as part of that duty they are empowered to pay school fees for those unable to pay.

The *Report on Irish Criminal and Judicial Statistics for* 1880 contains the following passage in reference to the want of compulsory education, as shown by the want of education amongst Irish prisoners and industrial school children:—

> "The statistics of education of prisoners shows that in the case of women and girls the largest proportion (nearly three-fifths), (59·3 per cent.), were wholly uneducated. Of children committed to industrial schools 56 per cent. could neither read nor write. In England and

> Wales the proportion of women and girls committed to prison who were wholly ignorant was only 39·2 per cent., and in France only 44 per cent. The Irish National school system seems to be successful for the class that falls within its reach, but the want of compulsory education leaves a considerable substratum not reached by the National school system, allowing a wholly ignorant class to grow up to form such a large proportion of those committed to prison."

It is clearly desirable, therefore, that the principle of securing the education of the entire population, which was partially adopted in England in 1870, and applied to the whole of Scotland in 1872, and to the whole of England in 1876, should be at once extended to Ireland; especially when we find the population of the United Kingdom, so intermixed as it is shown to be by the statistics of persons of Irish birth permanently residing in England and Scotland (1 in 13 of that above 20 in English towns, and 1 in 7 in Scotch towns), and by the large number of labourers (some 30,000) going over to both those countries for work. Any inequality in the provision made for securing the education of the poorer classes in Ireland, as compared to England and Scotland, places them under a serious disadvantage for earning their bread or taking their proper place in the social system while resident in other parts of the United Kingdom, and renders them unable to hold their position in countries such as the United States and Australia, where the policy of the state is to secure education to all classes of citizens.

Summary of Conclusions.

I shall briefly summarize the conclusions arrived at in this paper.

(1) That it is desirable to allow to the Irish Local Government the same latitude in administering the Poor-law, and to Irish Boards of Guardians the same powers and the same discretion in the exercise of their powers as are enjoyed respectively by the Local Government Board and the several Boards of Guardians in England.

(2) That the provisions for the proper care of lunatics in Ireland should be as extensive and complete as those existing in England.

(3) That a Metropolitan Poor Fund should be established for the metropolitan district of Dublin and its suburbs, and that for the rest of Ireland Union-rating should be adopted in lieu of the present system of rating by electoral divisions.

(4) That Boards of Guardians in Ireland should be empowered to see that all children shall attend some school, or be provided with proper means of education, and to pay school fees for those whose parents are unable to pay same.