

Howard Association report, October, 1884.

Contributors

Howard Association (London, England)
Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

London : Howard Association, 1884.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/qvku774a>

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

2.c.7.

HOWARD ASSOCIATION

REPORT.

10.

OCTOBER, 1884.

THE HOWARD ASSOCIATION WAS INSTITUTED (UNDER THE PATRONAGE
OF THE LATE LORD BROUGHAM) FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE BEST
METHODS OF CRIME PREVENTION AND PENAL TREATMENT.

PATRONS.

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF WESTMINSTER.
RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF DERBY.
RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF LICHFIELD.
RIGHT HON. JOHN BRIGHT, M.P.
HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL MANNING.
VERY REV. THE DEAN OF LLANDAFF.
SIR JOSEPH PEASE, Bart., M.P.
SIR JOHN H. KENNAWAY, Bart., M.P.
SIR ANDREW LUSK, Bart., M.P.
SIR J. EARDLEY WILMOT, Bart., M.P.
SIR T. F. BUXTON, Bart.
SIR CHARLES E. TREVELYAN, Bart.
SIR WILLIAM COLLINS.
JOHN BARRAN, Esq., M.P.
JACOB BRIGHT, Esq., M.P.
J. J. COLMAN, Esq., M.P.
JOHN CORBETT, Esq., M.P.
JAMES CROPPER, Esq., M.P.
W. F. ECROYD, Esq., M.P.

J. PASSMORE EDWARDS, Esq., M.P.
LEWIS FRY, Esq., M.P.
ALDERMAN R. N. FOWLER, M.P.
WILLIAM FOWLER, Esq., M.P.
HENRY LEE, Esq., M.P.
CHARLES E. LEWIS, Esq., M.P.
HUGH MASON, Esq., M.P.
ALEXANDER MCARTHUR, Esq., M.P.
SIR WILLIAM MCARTHUR, M.P.
SAMUEL MORLEY, Esq., M.P.
GEORGE PALMER, Esq., M.P.
ARTHUR PEASE, Esq., M.P.
FREDERICK PENNINGTON, Esq., M.P.
JOHN H. PULESTON, Esq., M.P.
SERJEANT SIMON, M.P.
SAMUEL SMITH, Esq., M.P.
P. A. TAYLOR, Esq. (late M.P.).
JOHN P. THOMASSON, Esq., M.P.
BENJAMIN WHITWORTH, Esq., M.P.

Treasurer—Alderman R. N. FOWLER, M.P.

Secretary—WILLIAM TALLACK, 5, Bishopsgate Without, London, E.C.

CONTENTS OF REPORT.

THE GREAT SOCIAL PROBLEM.—THE KENT JUSTICES.—THE ROYAL
COMMISSION ON REFORMATORIES AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.—
FRIENDLESS AND PAUPER CHILDREN.—PRISON OFFICERS.—PRISON
REPORTS.—CONVICT CLASSIFICATION.—MR. FRANCIS PEEK IN THE
"CONTEMPORARY REVIEW."—PRISON ARCHITECTURE; WORMWOOD
SCRUBBS.—PRISONERS' APPEALS.—IRISH PRISONS COMMISSION.—
PENALTY OF DEATH AND MURDERS.—FOREIGN EFFORTS.—SUP-
PORT OF THE ASSOCIATION.—&c.

OFFICE: 5, BISHOPSGATE STREET WITHOUT,
LONDON, E.C.



COMMITTEE AND SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS.

ARTHUR ALBRIGHT, Esq.
 RICHARD ALLEN, Esq.
 *STAFFORD ALLEN, Esq.
 M. P. VAN AMSTEL (Amsterdam).
 JAMES E. BACKHOUSE, Esq.
 THOMAS W. BACKHOUSE, Esq.
 ALEXANDER BALFOUR, Esq., J.P.
 M. BANG, Ministry of Justice, Christiania.
 JOHN BARING, Esq., J.P.
 J. GURNEY BARCLAY, Esq., J.P.
 HENRY FORD BARCLAY, Esq., J.P.
 THOMAS BARLOW, Esq.
 *RICHARD BARRETT, Esq.
 FRANCIS BASSETT, Esq., J.P.
 JOHN BAILY, Esq. (Plymouth).
 *W. W. BAYNES, Esq., J.P.
 THOMAS BEGGS, Esq.
 M. BELINFANTE (The Hague).
 M. BERDEN (Brussels).
 THOMAS BLAIN, Esq.
 E. L. J. BLYTH, Esq.
 M. G. BONJEAN (Paris).
 M. H. BOVEE, Esq. (U.S.).
 ALFRED BRABY, Esq.
 FREDERICK BRABY, Esq.
 C. LORING BRACE, Esq. (New York).
 J. BEVAN BRAITHWAITE, Esq.
 ISAAC BRAITHWAITE, Esq.
 Z. R. BROCKWAY, Esq. (Elmira, N.Y.)
 M. F. BRUNN (Copenhagen).
 WILBERFORCE BRYANT, Esq.
 FREDERICK C. BRYANT, Esq.
 S. GURNEY BUXTON, Esq., J.P.
 DON E. CASTELLOTE (Madrid).
 JOHN CADBURY, Esq.
 L. T. CAVE, Esq.
 *HENRY G. CHALKLEY, Esq.
 HAMILTON CASSELS, Esq. (Canada).
 R. L. CHANCE, Esq.
 JOHN H. CHANCE, Esq.
 JAMES CHESTERMAN, Esq.
 CHARLES F. COFFIN, Esq. (Indiana, U.S.)
 THOMAS COLLINSON, Esq.
 JOHN CORY, Esq., J.P.
 Colonel A. A. CROLL, J.P. (Ex-Sheriff).
 FREDERICK CROWLEY, Esq.
 M. FERNANDE DESPORTES (Paris).
 Herr G. EKERT (Freiburg).
 THOMAS EMMOTT, Esq., J.P.
 J. A. FARRER, Esq.
 C. E. FELTON, Esq. (Chicago).
 M. FÖHRING (Hamburg).
 *Alderman R. N. FOWLER, M.P.
 *JOSEPH JOHN FOX, Esq., F.S.S.
 ROBERT FOX, Esq. (Falmouth).
 WILLIAM B. GIBBINS, Esq.
 *ROBERT R. GLOVER, Esq., J.P.
 PHILIP GOLDSCHMIDT, Esq., J.P.
 G. S. GRIFFITHS, Esq. (Baltimore).
 *JOHN GROOM, Esq.
 H. E. GURNEY, Esq.
 JOHN GURNEY, Esq., J.P.
 W. N. HANCOCK, Esq., LL.D. (Dublin).
 ALFRED HARRIS, Esq., J.P.
 J. TINDALL HARRIS, Esq.
 JAMES HENDERSON, Esq.
 FREDERICK HILL, Esq.
 Dr. THOMAS HODGKIN.
 RICHARD HOLDSWORTH, Esq.
 Baron F. VON HOLZENDORFF (Munich).
 JOHN HORNIMAN, Esq.
 *GEORGE HURST, Esq., J.P.
 JOSEPH HUNTLEY, Esq.
 M. ILLING, Director of Prussian Prisons.

Hon. JOHN JARDINE (Rangoon).
 M. KROHNE (Germany).
 JOSIAH W. LEEDS, Esq. (Philadelphia, U.S.)
 WM. P. LETCHWORTH, Esq. (U.S.)
 M. KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE (Bruges).
 ARTHUR LISTER, Esq., J.P.
 GEORGE B. LLOYD, Esq., J.P.
 M. CHARLES LUCAS (France).
 M. LUIGI LUCCHINI (Rome).
 M. MODDERMAN (The Hague).
 M. S. DA MOTA (Lisbon).
 Hon. J. G. MOYLAN (Ottawa).
 Signor P. S. MANCINI (Rome).
 JOHN MATHER, Esq. (Manchester).
 JOSEPH B. MEAD, Esq.
 WILLIAM MIDDLEMORE, Esq., J.P.
 JOHN NOBLE, Esq., J.P. (Henley).
 M. de OLIVECRONA (Stockholm).
 M. LELLI ONOFRIO (Bologna).
 Dr. A. J. OURT (Philadelphia).
 WILLIAM I. PALMER, Esq., J.P.
 R. SORTON PARRY, Esq., J.P.
 H. FELL PEASE, Esq., J.P.
 M. RICHARD PETERSEN (Christiania).
 JONATHAN PIM, Esq., J.P.
 FREDERICK PITMAN, Esq.
 WILLIAM POLLARD, Esq., J.P.
 WYNDHAM PORTAL, Esq., J.P.
 ALFRED PRIESTMAN, Esq.
 FREDERICK PRIESTMAN, Esq., J.P.
 *FRANCIS PEEK, Esq.
 *JAMES S. RANDELL, Esq.
 C. D. RANDALL, Esq. (Michigan).
 *FRANCIS RECKITT, Esq., J.P.
 JAMES RECKITT, Esq.
 JAMES N. RICHARDSON, Esq.
 O. F. ROUTH, Esq.
 JOHN S. ROWNTREE, Esq., J.P.
 GEORGE ROOK, Esq.
 W. M. F. ROUND, Esq. (New York).
 M. T. ROUSSEL (Senator, Paris).
 JOHN RYLANDS, Esq., J.P.
 F. B. SANBORN, Esq. (Boston, U.S.)
 Signor BELTRANI SCALIA (Rome).
 JOSEPH S. SEWELL, Esq.
 ROBERT SMEAL, Esq.
 *CHARLES SMITH, Esq.
 WILLIAM SOMERVILLE, Esq., J.P.
 JAMES SPICER, Jun., Esq.
 M. J. STEVENS (Brussels).
 A. D. STEWART, Esq., Canada.
 M. F. STUCKENBERG (Copenhagen).
 *EDMUND STURGE, Esq.
 GEORGE STURGE, Esq.
 JOSEPH STURGE, Esq.
 ALFRED SUTTON, Esq., J.P.
 RICHARD TANGYE, Esq., J.P.
 GEORGE TANGYE, Esq.
 M. THONISSEN (Louvain).
 FIELDEN THORP, Esq., M.A.
 JAMES HACK TUKE, Esq.
 RICHARD VAUX, Esq. (Pennsylvania).
 Captain VERNEY, R.N.
 Professor WAHLBERG (Vienna).
 Prof. F. WAYLAND (Yale College, U.S.).
 ALFRED WEBB, Esq. (Dublin).
 JOHN EDWARD WILSON, Esq., J.P.
 CHARLES WILSON, Esq. (Shotley).
 THOMAS WILSON, Esq. (Craven).
 WILLIAM WINCH, Esq.
 FREDERICK H. WINES, Esq. (U.S.).
 Rev. J. WOODWORTH (San Francisco).
 *GEORGE R. VICARS, Esq.
 M. YVERNÈS (Ministry of Justice, Paris).

* Executive Committee.

N.B.—Members of the Association are not necessarily understood to be committed to the approval of ALL its objects.

THE HOWARD ASSOCIATION.

ANNUAL REPORT.

OCTOBER,

1884.



THE GREAT SOCIAL PROBLEM.

THE special degree of attention which, in so many quarters, has been directed, during the past year, to the great social problem of the best methods of ameliorating the condition of the overcrowded masses of the population, renders it appropriate for the Committee of the Howard Association to make some reference to their own long and steadily continued action in this direction. They have always urged that in regard to questions of CRIME and PAUPERISM, the best mode of procedure is to endeavour to *prevent* them. With this conviction, they have systematically directed a considerable portion of their efforts to the collection of facts, and the persevering diffusion (through the public press and otherwise) of information and suggestions, illustrative of the best practical modes of promoting those social conditions which tend to diminish crime and increase order and morality. In particular they have repeatedly sought to increase the attention of thoughtful persons to those FIRST PRINCIPLES in relation to these subjects which are so apt to be often overlooked, and especially during times of more than usually sensational interest is such questions.

Thus, in 1880, they prepared and very widely circulated a paper entitled "OVERCROWDING AND CRIME,"* in which it was especially pointed out that what is wanted is neither the wholesale destruction, nor construction, of the dwellings of the poor, at public expense, but rather the simple yet strong remedy of the appointment, by the Government, of "officers armed with *effectual powers* to prevent the erection of dwellings unfit for human habitation, and to make fit those now unfit, *at the expense of the owners.*" In their annual Report for the same year, the Committee further dwelt upon the absurdity and injustice of encouraging the owners of squalid human styies in their criminal neglect by actual compensation, as was largely done by recent legislation, and especially by "Cross's Act." As well might a butcher be compensated for being forbidden to sell rotten meat, or a careless chemist for no longer dispensing arsenic promiscuously. The owners of all houses should simply be required to maintain them in necessary sanitary condition, or to shut them up *until* so fitted for habitation. Inasmuch as the members

* This, with other papers and reports, issued from time to time by the Howard Association, is out of print, but may be referred to in various libraries, as for example those of the British Museum, the Statistical Society, &c.

of many of the VESTRIES, or other local bodies, are themselves pecuniarily interested in the maintenance of such slums, therefore the Committee, in their issue of 1880, specially urged the appointment of officers, or "Ædiles," "armed with effectual powers"—that is, to be responsible to the central Government, or LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD, and not, as hitherto, to the Vestries merely.

But this was a chief practical conclusion subsequently arrived at by the best writers and speakers during the general discussion of the same question in 1883-84.

One of the ablest of these writers and speakers, Mr. SAMUEL SMITH, M.P. (a valued member of the Howard Association) has during 1884, added some practical contributions to this controversy, as by pointing out that actual harm would be done if the Communistic system of providing very cheap dwellings for the poor, at the public expense, were adopted. The great cities, especially London, would thus offer further temptations to very poor people from the provinces and from abroad to crowd into them. Then the labour market in these cities would be still more overcrowded, wages further lowered, and poverty consequently increased. The natural laws of supply and demand operate more wisely and mercifully, in the long run, than artificial interferences with them, however well-meant. Only the supply must be a sanitary one, and not of legalised slums and fever dens. Many landlords, and some Members of Parliament, specially amenable to vested interests, cannot see, or will not adopt, the obvious simple remedy. They resemble the slaveholder, whose invincible ignorance of the rights of liberty was illustrated by placing a coin over the word "God." So, often, pecuniary interests blind the eyes and will to what is due to both God and man. The Legislature of NEW SOUTH WALES appears to have more promptly seen the way to obviate much of the evil of unsanitary dwellings. They compel the owners of slums to destroy or renovate them, and entirely at their own private cost, such cost being some degree of just compensation to the public for the sin of having permitted these slums to exist.

The lately appointed English ROYAL COMMISSION on the DWELLINGS OF THE POOR may be expected to collect and publish many interesting details of information. But it is not likely to issue any final general recommendation more practical than one for the enforcement of landlords' responsibilities and of the abundant sanitary provisions of existing laws, by means of independent inspectors and local officers, responsible mainly to the Central Government.

It is a first principle of Social Science that the sources of overcrowded squalor and vice are to be found mainly in such causes as IRRELIGION, INTEMPERANCE, and IMPROVIDENCE. To some extent the nature of the dwelling moulds the nature of the people. But, in far greater and more general degree, the habits of the latter affect the state of the former. Some years ago, many of the best houses in Boston (U.S.A.), the former residences of rich merchants who have betaken themselves to the suburbs, came into the possession of persons who let them out, in rooms and tenements, to a poor and squalid class of the population. The result was a speedy dilapidation of these fine old houses, which became as filthy and shabby as other slums. A similar effect has been produced, in many neat new cottages at Walthamstow, Tottenham and other suburbs of London, through their treatment by a morally low class of tenants. If millions of money were expended on new dwellings for such people it would be a huge waste. The first thing to be done is to promote, by individual and church effort, the extension of EDUCATION, TEMPERANCE, and RELIGION.

In 1876 the Howard Association prepared and very widely diffused another paper on this great social problem, as regards some of its most fundamental points. It was entitled "MODES OF DIMINISHING INTEMPERANCE," and received the special commendation of the late Archbishop of CANTERBURY (Dr. TAIT), the present Bishop of LONDON, and the late Dean of WESTMINSTER (Dr. STANLEY). Amongst the needed reforms therein advocated were a more effectual restriction of those chief causes of drunkenness and poverty, the excessively superabundant licensed houses for the sale of alcoholic drinks. The Committee then remarked:—"Without even changing the existing body of Licensing Magistrates, it would be very advantageous to select from their present lists, small committees of not more than three Justices for each Division of every County, to whom should be absolutely committed the granting and control of all Licenses in the district, *without any appeal to the Quarter Sessions, and without any collateral grants of Licenses by the Excise.* Members of Quarter Sessions are apt to have no knowledge of local wants, and a mere Excise body may have no conscience. Hence, LOCAL OPTION, in some form, is essential."

The Committee, on the same occasion, drew attention to the great success, over a limited area, which had already attended the efforts of the local Magistracy and Police (but stimulated mainly by several energetic teetotalers) at LUTON, in Bedfordshire, to resolutely enforce the provisions of the existing "PREVENTION OF CRIME ACT," so far as applicable to low public-houses harbouring disorderly characters.

The Committee added the following remark, which is as much applicable now as in 1876:—

"Yet, in various large places, the Liquor Traffic influence can so far control both the Magistracy and the Police as to secure a general laxity of supervision. Hence the appointment of INDEPENDENT INSPECTORS, by the GOVERNMENT, or by LOCAL OPTION COMMITTEES, or local MUNICIPAL BODIES, to act as general supervisors (similar to the Inspectors of Factories, &c.), and to have power to summon defaulters before the Courts, would be a further check on existing evils."

As to SUNDAY DRINKING, it was added that if the total closing of public-houses on that day could not be secured, at any rate there should be a considerable extra charge for licenses to sell liquor on Sundays, and permitted on only a very limited scale.

Both in the paper quoted and in the Annual Report of the Howard Association for 1876, the Committee dwelt at some length on the importance of affording greater facilities and encouragement to the poorer classes for acquiring habits of THRIFT. Their Report of that year, in particular, contained a suggestion which has, *since*, been extensively and prominently taken up in other quarters, namely, the desirability of establishing a NATIONAL CLUB, or at least some further provision for the promotion of Thrift by Government aid.

The Committee then urged that, in view of the bitter disappointment and misery occasioned to thousands of helpless and ignorant victims of insolvent or fraudulent "Friendly Societies" and private Clubs, there should be established a GOVERNMENT CLUB universally accessible to all contributors, and securing regular assistance in the time of SICKNESS AND OLD AGE. Of course there would be practical difficulties, and imposture would have to be carefully guarded against. But the Committee thought that most of these difficulties would be obviated by the adoption of three general principles.

Firstly, that the provision obtainable through such a Club should be limited to amounts sufficient to obviate destitution. Secondly, that the *bona fide* nature of sickness, or incapacity, in regard to claims on the Club, should be established not only by the non-receipt of any pay for work, but by the certificate of some *impartial* local authority. And thirdly, that the remuneration of the local doctors employed in connection with such a

Government Club should be made, at least in part, dependent on the absence rather than the presence of claims on the ground of disease; an additional stimulus to the prevention of sickness and the detection of imposition being thus afforded.

Other modes and aspects of Thrift, Temperance, &c., were also dwelt upon by the Committee at that time, as also subsequently.

The Committee have reason to believe that their persevering action in these and similar directions has usefully contributed to increase the public interest and practical efforts in reference to such questions.

It is interesting to observe that the Great Social Problem is not only being studied, as to its yet unsolved difficulties, but it is also being practically solved to no inconsiderable extent, and in many directions, by the respective action of both organized and individual efforts, each of which is essential in its place. But there has been, there is, and there will be, little if any real progress, apart from a *religious* basis. Hence the special success which has attended the labours of the LONDON CITY MISSION, the SALVATION ARMY, and numerous CHURCHES and CHAPELS whose ministers and members have for years past pursued a persevering course of *local* elevation of the poor. Many of these have been very effective, though comparatively little known, as compared with other similar movements.

Mr. WILLIAM CUFF, an active pastor of a large East End chapel, recently summed up the practical aspects of the subject thus:—"I have no new method to argue into existence as a means of reaching the people and changing their condition. I have but little confidence in anything the Law can do for the people except it is to put bit and bridle on the burning mouth of the drink traffic and sweep away half the public-houses. You may pull down the shanties and build model houses with next to no rent; but if you do not, and cannot, *change the people themselves*, the 'Bitter Cry' will mock your effort, and this social and moral corruption will rot and fester still. EDUCATION will do something; but I do not rest in the dream of Mr. G. R. Sims that it will change the condition. EMIGRATION does not touch the real sore place in the body politic; and I have no hope that it will. If I am so negative in all this, what is the positive position I would take and would urge on others? My reply is explicit and emphatic—*Just what we have taken*; and as much more, on the same lines, as is possible. I plead that no spasm of excitement be allowed to turn us away from old and well-tried methods to new and uncertain ones. Let every Church foster her best life and use her best gifts and graces for *purely home mission work* and the change in the condition of the people will be marked and marvellous. We need not despair, with the GOSPEL in our hands and GOD at our back, pledged, by every sacred word of promise and love, to help us. Let us do our proper work and carry the Gospel to every house, and every man, woman and child. If we search for their souls, as for a treasure, we shall find them in gutter, alley and slum—poor, hard and prejudiced; but responsive to the touch of a noble sympathy and *capable of being won back to God*."

Another practical solver of the Great Social Problem, and on a large scale, Mr. C. H. SPURGEON, lately gave almost an identical experience with the above. He said, "I have no new specific for the betterment of the world, no new specific, only to keep on as *we* are going; only *more* so. Especially more City Missionaries, more house-to-house and room-to-room Visitation."

THE KENT JUSTICES AND THE HOWARD ASSOCIATION.

Amongst the gratifying indications that the labours of the Howard Association, in various directions, are exercising a beneficial influence and meeting with acceptance by practical men, the Committee may mention that in a pamphlet issued last year by order of the ANNUAL GENERAL SESSIONS OF KENT, and signed by a Committee of eight local magistrates, namely, Earl SYDNEY, Earl STANHOPE, Viscount HARDINGE, Mr. JOHN G. TALBOT, M.P., Mr. WALTER H. JAMES, M.P., Hon. J. S. GATHORNE-HARDY, Mr. J. F. LENNARD, and Mr. A. BEATTIE, there is given more than two pages of quotation from a pamphlet on VAGRANCY prepared by the Howard Association in the preceding year; and the Justices add:—

"Your Committee would recommend the perusal, by individual members of the Court, of the Report of the Howard Association before referred to; the object of that Report being the education of the public mind in reference to

the causes and prevention of the constantly increasing evils of Vagrancy and its attendant consequences."

A second pamphlet, signed by the same eight noblemen and gentlemen, was issued by order of the COURT OF SESSIONS FOR KENT, at Maidstone, six months later, in which the Justices remark:—

"Your Committee are very desirous that the attention of BOARDS OF GUARDIANS should be directed to the extracts from a Report recently issued by the Howard Association, which are quoted in the last Report of the Committee of Justices, upon Vagrancy, in the County of Kent, with regard to THE EVILS OF INDISCRIMINATE ALMSGIVING; and they would urge them to adopt every means in their power to induce the public to discontinue the practice."

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON REFORMATORIES, &c.

During the past year there has been issued a comprehensive REPORT from the ROYAL COMMISSION ON REFORMATORIES AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, containing much valuable evidence and many practical suggestions. Considering the special importance of all which relates to the prevention of crime, or its arrest in its earliest stages, the Committee of the Howard Association have devoted their endeavours to promote and extend the circulation and knowledge of that Report in other countries, and especially in the British Colonies and the United States. Grateful acknowledgments have been received from State officers and private philanthropists in these countries.

At home, also, the Committee have sought to utilise this Report in various ways. There is one point upon which more emphatic and decided recommendations would have been desirable, although the Commissioners have not been wholly silent upon it, namely, the importance of better CLASSIFICATION in the establishments reported on, and in particular an entire separation between the younger children and the elder youth.

By means of letters in the newspapers and to influential persons, the Committee have urged the necessity for public attention to this point. Their views have received repeated confirmation and approval from some of the ablest and most experienced managers of Reformatories and Industrial Schools.

The Chaplain of one of the largest Reformatories writes to the Committee:—

"The evils resulting from a promiscuous intercourse of the elder and younger boys in Reformatories can hardly be described in words. The corruption to which I allude is the root of almost every outbreak of insubordination, incendiarism and so forth, of which we so frequently hear, in connection with Reformatories. You will be doing good service to the State by continuing to draw the attention of the public to this most important subject."

Amongst the letters received in relation to this subject is one from Captain BROOKS, the efficient Superintendent of the large INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL for boys, for MIDDLESEX, at FELTHAM. His position and experience give special value to his opinions. The Committee, however, are not prepared to endorse them in their entirety, though heartily uniting with much that he expresses. As to the mischief wrought by the drunken and vicious parents who have insisted upon resuming their control over their children, on leaving Feltham, this has resulted in their ruin so often as to impress Captain Brooks strongly on the question. Even on the occasion of their visits to the children on Bank Holidays, so many of the parents and "friends" used to arrive drunk that it was found necessary to forbid their visits on such days. Captain Brook's letter is as follows:—

(FELTHAM EXPERIENCE.)

"MIDDLESEX INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, FELTHAM,

"21st April, 1884.

"DEAR SIR,

"I regret that several pressing matters have delayed my reply to yours of the 15th instant.

"The longer I live, the more I am convinced that the *first* and *primary* point to attain, in order to render the Reformatory and Industrial School System in any way a satisfactory success, is to abolish the power of control of the parents of the children detained in them, absolutely and entirely, and to substitute that of the Managers, in their place, subject to such qualifying conditions as may seem desirable.

"When you have cleared the ground by this Act—and an Act with one clause would accomplish it—a system of classification could be easily proceeded with.

"Schools might be arranged as follows:—(1) *Reformatories*, for children over 14 and under 16 years of age; for vicious children between 12 and 14:—these last however to be sent to certain special Reformatories. (2) *Industrial Schools*, for children under 14 found wandering, vagrant, &c., to be sent to one set of schools, and those charged with theft to another set, so as to keep the two types of children separate and distinct.

"As to internal arrangement I always think that system is best which is best managed. I know of large schools excellently managed, and of schools on the so-called family system in an infamous state, and *vice versa*.

"But what I hasten to arrive at is the result to be attained by the abolition of paternal control, and it is the one on which the whole system hangs, viz.:—the ultimate disposal of the children.

"My panacea is a well-established system of Emigration, and a large development, in the Colonies, of the Boarding-out System, to be extended to all *Industrial Schools*, retaining no child in England, except under very special circumstances, after 15, but at that age sending them to small home-like Depôts in the Colonies, where they could be easily placed out in suitable situations;—the demand for children of that age, *previously trained to habits of industry*, is simply without limit.

"The disposal of Boys from Reformatories requires much more discrimination: some, no doubt, should be emigrated, but some would, if sent, bring discredit on the system, and the best provision for these, if they could be got to stick to it, would be the sea; in any case no child should be detained in a reformatory over 18 years of age; many are now so detained until 21! and I consider this to be productive of the greatest evils.

"But abolish parental control and twenty times as much good will be effected than is the case at present—socially, financially and morally.

"I hope you will some day find time to run down and pay us another visit; about June the place looks very pretty.

"Very faithfully yours,

"J. ROWLAND BROOKS.

"To Mr. W. TALLACK."

FRIENDLESS AND PAUPER CHILDREN.

In further promotion of the interests of neglected children, the Committee have recently prepared and widely circulated, a paper entitled "*The Supervision of Pauper and Friendless Children*," treating of the greater economy and efficiency of the individualising principle of management, with systematic supervision by a combination of voluntary with official action, as compared with the costly pauperising tendencies of barrack-like institutions for such children and of excessive expenditure upon their support.

This paper has been very favourably received by the press and by persons practically interested in the subject.

In connection with this question, it may be here mentioned that in their last year's Report, the Committee, always anxious to make just acknowledgment of well-meant efforts, took occasion to observe that "it is due to the District Schools, for Pauper Children, to state that they give a much better industrial training and settlement to *Boys* than is usually obtainable by Boarding-out. But in regard to *Girls* the case is different." Hereupon Miss JOANNA M. HILL, an active member of a Committee of Supervision of children boarded out at King's Norton Union, near Birmingham, has written to inform the Committee that

this concession to the merits of the District Schools is too generous to that class of institutions as compared with boarding-out. And the Committee are now informed that around Birmingham it is found, in practice, that boys who are boarded out in carefully-selected cottage homes are as well trained in industrial skill as in the far more costly establishments and schools. (The same correspondent has forwarded a copy of a new pamphlet which the Committee are glad to recommend as being one of the best and most comprehensive upon this question, entitled "*The Education of Pauper Children, Industrially and otherwise*," by Rev. J. O. Bevan, Chaplain to the Aston Union Workhouse, near Birmingham, to be had of the Author, price 6d.)

The latest annual report of the King's Norton Union Committee states that "The Boarding-out System prepares the boys, almost without exception, to be fit to earn their own living without any expensive training in special trades, at 13 years of age, instead of retaining them until 14 or 15, which seems to be necessary under other systems. Not one of the 31 boys who have been boarded-out under our charge, and, having ceased to be paupers on attaining 13 years of age, has since become chargeable to the rates for any cause whatsoever."

But not merely in the general oversight but also in the original selection of children for Boarding-out, is great care essential. An esteemed member of the Howard Association, residing in Westmorland, writes to the Committee:—"The unhealthiness of the children sent down here (from the cities) goes far to defeat the labour and expense which is undergone for them. This refers to the Girls. Few are fit to go into service on a par with other girls. My impression is that the most indifferent in health and constitution are sent down here."—Very favourable reports, however, are the general result of the system.

In dealing with neglected children, grave difficulties present themselves on every hand, and it is especially needful to endeavour so to act as to avoid an increase of pauperisation by the very means designed to relieve destitution.

The aged, the infirm, the blind, the orphan, these and such as these are objects for charity. Yet even in these cases some care is requisite that the gifts bestowed do not obviate any measure of self-help still possible. But where free education, free board and lodging and clothing, all at the expense of the hard-working and honest tax-payer are offered by wholesale to the families of the improvident, the intemperate and the indolent, they will be sure to accept such offers greedily and spend the money, thus saved to themselves, in further vice and drunkenness.

Both in Great Britain and the United States, there is a large and dangerous amount of practical Communism extending into the management of PAUPER SCHOOLS, REFORMATORIES, INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, and last, but not least, even into the BOARD SCHOOLS. The honest and hard-working classes of tax-payers need more jealousy to watch their own interests in these matters. Scores of thousands of wilfully neglected children will be increasingly supplied by willingly improvident parents to the perniciously too hospitable doors of such institutions.

It is in view of the increasing dangers of this wholesale public pauperisation, under the guise of a false benevolence, that the Committee of the Howard Association continue to advocate more discrimination, and more economy in these directions. Hence they have promoted the Boarding-out of Pauper Children, which costs about £12 per annum, or even less, rather than the £25 or £30 each, which is now annually expended upon upwards of ten thousand children in the Metropolitan district alone. The boarded-out children are found to be free from the ophthalmia, itch, and other diseases which infest the best Pauper District Schools, whilst they (especially the girls) also become more self-helpful in after-life than the inmates of the latter.

An active member of the Committee of a large Industrial School, near Manchester, lately wrote to the Howard Association deprecating some of their criticisms upon the costliness of many such establishments. He stated that 80 per cent. or more of the children ultimately turn out well. This is so far

good. But the point which he appeared, like many other kind-hearted men, to quite overlook, and which is of still greater importance, is how best to prevent so many children from being turned IN to pauper schools and similar institutions.

There are two other modes of aid to destitute children which may be cordially recommended.

The first of these is the opening of suitable reading and recreation rooms, supplied with light and warmth, for use in wet and inclement weather. A WESLEYAN MINISTER recently made the experiment of hiring a large room for the winter, with fire, gas, and a few books and periodicals. He allowed a certain number of poor boys and girls the free use of this room, on condition of quietness and good behaviour. These conditions were well observed and at the end of the season the poor children most gratefully thanked their benefactor for the welcome and truly useful boon he had bestowed upon them.

The municipal authorities of BIRMINGHAM have on various occasions utilized some of the Board School Rooms and Bingley Hall for somewhat similar objects. Doubtless in many cases the recipients of such accommodation would willingly pay a small amount towards the expenses. But a more general provision of accommodation and recreation in this direction is as yet one of the chief desiderata of modern philanthropy. It is to be hoped that the coming few years may largely solve the problem.

Another way of helping this class of children is to be found in the praiseworthy action already begun by several Municipal bodies, as at BRADFORD, NOTTINGHAM, BIRMINGHAM, LEICESTER, &c., in promoting local bye-laws against the employment of very young children in selling papers, &c., in the streets at night. The BIRMINGHAM bye-law forbids any parent to send a child, under twelve years of age, for street traffic, after nine o'clock. In one or two cases such occupation of any children, under eight or ten years, is forbidden at any hour.

But, finally, every form of juvenile destitution and neglect is mainly the result of parental INTemperance. Hence the *most* effective of all counter-actives consists in the best means for promoting TEMPERANCE, with its attendant train of industrious, thrifty, and moral habits.

BRITISH PRISONS.

THE WARDERS.

The Prison System of Great Britain, notwithstanding various important improvements which have been made during the past half-century, still requires a constant vigilance on the part of the public. It is one of the objects of the Howard Association to promote and maintain this, especially as to certain points of the administration.

One of these is the position and treatment of the WARDERS, to which during the past year the Committee have continued to direct attention. For notwithstanding the efforts already put forth for improvements in this direction, as to the insufficient numbers, and the too-prolonged hours of duty of these officers, their condition still needs further amelioration at the hands of the chief authorities. However, it is gratifying to notice some progress during the past year.

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT, Mr. JOHN T. HIBBERT, M.P., in a courteous letter to the Secretary of the Howard Association, dated May 5, 1884, wrote as follows:—"With respect to your

remarks about the necessity for an increase of the number of Warders, I am glad to say that we have just authorised the appointment of twenty-one additional Warders for night duty, and asked the Treasury to assent to the provision of a free meal for the night warders."

About the same time the LORD MAYOR OF LONDON, Mr. ROBERT N. FOWLER, at the request of this Association, drew the further attention of the Home Office to the matter, in the House of Commons, and was informed that besides the increase of night warders, the higher ranks of subordinate warders have had some additional leave of absence. It was added that the Treasury officers of the Government are of opinion that if it be desirable to alter the general terms of retirement for the convict service, it should be done by special legislation. This the Secretary of State is not prepared at present to undertake.

It is to be hoped that from time to time further improvements may be secured in reference to the selection and condition of these officers.

A still larger proportion of Warders to prisoners is one of the pressing needs of some of the prisons, especially those for convicts.

OFFICIAL PRISON REPORTS.

The Committee's attention has also been drawn to the need for more respectful attention on the part of the Commissioners of Local Gaols to the reports and recommendations of the Visiting Justices of those establishments.

It is essential for the better administration of prisons that *all* the Reports of the Local Visiting Committees of Magistrates to the Home Office should be made public. At present the whole system, both as to the Commissioners' procedure and the observations and recommendations of the Justices, are too much covered by a dense cloud of mystery and concealment. Grave abuses may take place inside prisons, against which the existing system of nominal oversight is no effectual preventive or check.

The reports or letters forwarded to the Secretary of State from the unpaid, but officially appointed, Visitors of Convict Prisons, should also be printed with the Directors' annual Blue Book.

Further, the *sub*-reports sent to the Home Office from the Governors, Chaplains and Medical officers of prisons, should be printed with the annual Reports, and *in full*. Until this is done, the Reports on Prisons, as now issued yearly by the British Government, will continue to possess very limited authority, and to deserve only a qualified reliance.

As to the OFFICIAL STATISTICS of Prisons, in particular, these are of such a character, that the Committee have, during the past year, felt it their duty to draw public attention, in various journals, to some of the figures published in the REPORT of the COMMISSIONERS of LOCAL GAOLS for 1883.

For instance, in that Report, there are enormous sums credited to the "profit" of the prison labour in the respective gaols, from the simple process of pumping the daily supplies of water either by the treadwheel or by hand labour. Stafford Gaol, with a daily average of 559 prisoners throughout the past year, is credited with the extreme estimate of £897 for "pumping water," and an additional £503 for the ordinary work of "cleaning" (sweeping, brushing, scouring, &c.). At Salford Gaol, Manchester, with 963 prisoners, only £31 is credited for "pumping," but the "cleaning" amounts to £620. Liverpool (Walton) Gaol credits £301 for "pumping," and £321 for "nursing," whilst its "cleaning" is £881. At Devizes (eighty-five inmates), under the euphemistic expression of "grinding corn," the treadwheel is credited with

£97, and a further £27 for "pumping water." Coldbath Fields (London) takes credit for £229 for "stoking," and the very easy and almost valueless work of "sorting and tearing old paper" is estimated as worth £433. Many more similarly swollen "returns" appear in this report, which is as objectionable by its omission of needful information as by its insertion of what is worse than unnecessary. One can but wonder how any Department of State could have seriously entertained such figures, to say nothing of actually publishing them.

It is obvious that, by such a mode of managing figures and manufacturing "values," there need be scarcely any limit to the "satisfactory" returns of prisons—*upon paper*.

Whereas in reality, the industrial earnings and profits of English prisons have materially diminished under the Commissioners. Such prisons as those of HULL, SALFORD, BEDFORD, and DURHAM, and various others, which were once hives of useful industry, have experienced a very great falling off in this respect during the past five years, so far as *bonâ fide* results are the test.

MR. PEEK, IN THE *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW*, ON PRISONS.

The Committee desire to refer, with grateful satisfaction, to a valuable paper upon the general subject of English Prison administration, by their esteemed colleague, Mr. FRANCIS PEEK, which appeared in the *Contemporary Review* for JULY, 1884, entitled "OFFICIAL OPTIMISM.—PRISON REPORTS." It has been favourably noticed by influential journals, and merits attentive perusal. With a fair and courteous disposition to the authorities, but in plain-spoken terms, it points out the unreliability of the British Official Reports on Prisons, as hitherto prepared and published, also the chief defects of the existing system of Prison Administration.

INSANE AND WEAK-MINDED PRISONERS.

The Secretary of this Association has during recent visits to prisons, repeatedly had brought under his notice the grave inconveniences resulting from the considerable number of insane or weak-minded persons who are received into the local gaols. This involves, in many cases, the placing of prisoners in association, three or more in a cell, *by night* as well as by day—a most objectionable, but now very common, practice in English gaols.

More power ought to be given to the local officers promptly to send such prisoners to Asylums, or some other place more suitable than a prison.

This class appears to be on the increase. The problem of their best disposal must claim serious attention from the Medical Officers of prisons.

If prisoners, whether in the convict establishments or in the local gaols, require special medical attention, on the grounds of insanity, or doubtful sanity, they should be also removed to some place suitable to the circumstances of such persons. This has, to a considerable extent, been done, with regard to convicts. But better arrangements are urgently needed in the Local Gaols in this direction.

More uniformity also in the exercise of Medical functions, in general, is requisite. Serious injury to the discipline is experienced in some prisons for want of the individual peculiarities of the local Surgeon being guided, or even controlled, if necessary, by the advice of a superior Medical authority.

The PRISON HOSPITALS, also, may well claim some effort to brighten them a little and to diminish the excessive dulness and gloom which are apt to characterize them.

PRISON ARCHITECTURE.

WORMWOOD SCRUBBS.

English Prison Architecture has hitherto been, on the whole, the best of its class in the world. And one of the very best instances is to be found in the new prison for convicts at WORMWOOD SCRUBBS, near London—a prison of which also it may be remarked that it is under the management of a Governor, Captain W. TALBOT HARVEY, so efficient and firmly humane, that if all prison officers were like him there would be little need for either Home Office interference or Howard Association criticism. Yet the congregate system of that, as of other prisons, is open to serious objection. But Captain Harvey is one of those men, too rarely found, who can administer any system with success. Wormwood Scrubbs has been almost entirely constructed by convict labour. Its lofty gateway is ornamented with large medallions of JOHN HOWARD and ELIZABETH FRY—figures at least not inappropriate in connection with the present administration of this establishment.

But a retrogression appears to have recently commenced in some other places. For example, the new wing at YORK CASTLE prison is, especially in respect of *light* and *ventilation*, a very inferior construction. Even the generally well-built new prison at BARLINNIE, near Glasgow, is defective as to insufficient light in the cells. The sanitary influence of sunshine and light is very important, both in prisons and everywhere else. Some prisons, however, are excellently lighted, but many English prison cells are so dark that their inmates can hardly see to read. Even criminals may justly claim a sufficiency of light and air. At Wormwood Scrubbs, Sir E. Du Cane has introduced a praiseworthy improvement by substituting transparent glass in the upper portions of the windows, instead of the very opaque glass too common in other prisons.

CONVICT CLASSIFICATION.

The Committee have reason to know that their Reports and their communications to the newspapers, during the past two years in particular, have received respectful attention from influential authorities. Amongst the points to which they have directed special attention, is the necessity for a further classification of convicts; and in this some progress is now being made by the Directors of the Prisons.

Whilst the recommendation of this Committee that convicts not previously convicted should be placed in prisons wholly devoted to that class has not yet been fully acted upon, yet it is being approximated to by the formation of a "star" class in certain prisons, for those convicts only who are undergoing their first committal. A further step in the right direction is also being taken by removing many of these to one particular prison, at Chattenden, near Chatham, which has thus practically become an establishment for a distinct category of prisoners.

The Committee are reliably informed that this experiment has so far worked well. They therefore now recommend that the process be carried still further, and that the next class of convicts, those with only two committals, or at least those of decidedly less criminality than the worst and habitual offenders, should also be separated from the latter.

But whilst the Committee thus gratefully acknowledge the action of the authorities in this direction, they remain of opinion that a still better mode

of classification, and, indeed, the only truly successful one, is that which consists in the total separation of prisoners from *each other*, but accompanied by the essential concomitant of a great increase of useful intercourse both with the official custodians and suitable volunteer visitors.

Of course this would necessarily involve a revolution also in the length of sentences. Two or three years' *separate* (but not solitary) confinement would be incomparably more deterrent, more reformatory and more economical, than five, seven, ten, or more years in the existing gangs.

The frequency of burglaries and murderous attacks upon the Police by discharged convicts during the past year, points to the absolute necessity for further attention both to classification in the prisons, and to oversight after discharge.

PRISONERS' APPEALS.

The strong representations made by the Howard Association, as to the need for some effectual provision for securing attention to the appeals of prisoners, especially convicts, appear to have received serious notice from the Home Office. Sir William Harcourt, at any rate, has given personal attention to such appeals, to an extent unknown to his predecessors. Indeed the Committee have of late received complaints, from trustworthy sources, that the freedom of appeal has been carried too far in some instances, and that both superior and subordinate officers have had false charges brought against them, with impunity, by prisoners, to their serious detriment and annoyance. Such charges also, when in various instances proved to have been false, have not brought upon their authors the restrictions or the punishments which were deserved. This appears to call for practical attention by the Home Secretary. It is obvious that if reckless and revengeful convicts are allowed, with impunity, to send to the Secretary of State, not merely frivolous but wholly false complaints, they will both injure the character of meritorious officers and also inflict serious wrong upon those of their fellow-prisoners who may occasionally have real causes for complaint. For the permission of impunity to a number of false representations tends to bring into discredit and neglect the statements of others absolutely deserving attention by their truthfulness.

It is impossible that any Secretary of State, or indeed any body of Commissioners resident in London, can give adequate and discriminating attention to the *details* of many hundred prison appeals. Hence further provision should be made for their examination and disposal by *impartial local* visitors, or referees, willing to give due time and effort to such duties.

The recent appointment of two or three official visitors to each Convict Prison was a step in the right direction, but for certain obvious reasons it has only been partially successful, as yet.

It may be noted that in SCOTLAND there is some considerable degree of local selection and responsibility as to Prison Visitors. And in Scotch prisons consequently, there have been fewer inconveniences resulting. But the attention of the Government is requisite to the circumstance that two of the chief Scotch prisons, those of PERTH (General Prison) and BARLINNIE (Glasgow) have *no* "visitors." This should be promptly remedied.

BRITISH PRISON OFFICERS.

The Committee have recently learnt, with much regret, that in various cases where Warders or other Officers have, on quitting the prison service, applied for employment elsewhere, they have been rejected, from a mistaken

idea that from the mere fact of their having been employed in the custody of criminals they must have been so harsh and brutal as to be unfit for ordinary civil occupations. It affords the Committee pleasure to bear testimony to the fact that there are to be found amongst the officers, both higher and subordinate, of British Prisons, many of the kindest and most considerate of persons. Of course there are also "some black sheep" there, as everywhere; but, especially of late years, a marked improvement has taken place in the selection of these officers. Their duties, especially those of the Warders, are of the most harassing and often very irritating character. Hence the Committee would afresh express a hope that the Home Office authorities will further consider what may be done to lessen this strain and friction.

And on the other hand, the attention of the Warders themselves may also be usefully directed to the importance, even in their own interests, of cultivating such a conscientious and considerate mode of discharging their duties as may raise their reputation as a class, both within the prison walls and amongst the public in general.

The CHAPLAINS in particular can render important services to the Warders, and through them to the prisoners, by devoting more sympathetic attention to the former than has hitherto been generally the case. The duties of the Chaplains are often perhaps even *more* influential through the Warders and other Officers than as directly influencing the prisoners.

It is however to be noted that at present the unintermitting pressure of the Warders' duties does not afford time for such attention on the part of the Chaplains. It is well deserving the consideration of the Home Office authorities whether they cannot devise arrangements whereby the moral and intellectual improvement of the Warders may not receive more definite and more leisurely attention than hitherto. (A little progress is being made, in the direction of Officers' reading-rooms.)

Lectures to the subordinate officers by some experienced Governor, or other authority, are also very desirable. On one occasion something of this nature was tried and with decidedly good effect. Amongst the wise counsels then given, by a veteran officer, was the supremely practical one of a daily regard to their own individual responsibility to God, with the suggestion that it would tend to afford them peace, on laying their heads on their pillows at night, to reflect that during the past day they had each done some service for God by a conscientious endeavour to cherish a merciful consideration towards those, who, however erring, are still His creatures, objects of His Divine compassion.

IRISH PRISONS' COMMISSION.

Sir William Harcourt has shown considerable ability as Home Secretary, but has manifested a persistent sensitiveness as to public criticisms on his prison administration, which has led him into observations, especially on newspaper comments, singularly inappropriate. One of his favourite allusions is to irresponsible critics in the press. So far as the criticisms of the Howard Association are concerned, they have been decisively vindicated by its Chairman, Mr. Francis Peek, in the columns of the *Contemporary Review* for July, 1884.

But Sir William's high ground of official prison optimism is also cut from beneath his feet by the admissions made in the REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON IRISH PRISONS, issued in AUGUST, 1884. That body, of which Sir RICHARD CROSS, the ex-Home Secretary, was Chairman, can certainly not be termed an irresponsible one. But its revelations are very damaging indeed

to the character of the prison administration. Amongst other very objectionable features of the Irish Prison *regime*, the Commissioners state—

1.—That the chiefs of the Prison Department have been on such bad terms with one another that “It is in evidence that there has been for some time an *entire suspension of communication, except in writing*, between the Chairman of the Board and the Inspector of the District!” (parag. 29). The Commissioners however comment on this strange state of things, and similar matters, in a tone of extremely mild expostulation. They further remark (parag. 56), “We have observed, with regret, that there is considerable friction in the relation of some Medical Officers with the Board.”

2.—That after seven years’ entire control of the Irish Prisons by their present administrators, “many” of them “fail to fulfil the requirements of the present day,” and “only five” are up to the modern standard of arrangement (parag. 4).

3.—That the cost, both of officers and prisoners, is excessive. For example, each convict at LUSK now costs the taxpayer “about £86 a-head” per annum! (parag. 119). [Under Sir Walter Crofton it was less than £30 per head.]

4.—The Commissioners remark, “One of the most serious points which has been brought under our notice is the *large* number of prisoners *certified to be insane* in the Irish Convict Prisons!” (parag. 124).

5.—And yet, whilst such is the case, it is also stated that “an excessive number of punishments appear to have been inflicted, but these were cases of refractory prisoners whose mental condition may be described as the borderland between sanity and insanity” (parags. 12 and 127). [Is it just to punish *such* wretched creatures in an “excessive” proportion?]

6.—That the presumed “inspection” or “visitation” of Irish convicts has for years past been mainly imaginary. For the COMMISSIONERS report, “The Lord-Lieutenant, in 1880, appointed certain gentlemen as Visitors of the several convict prisons; but we find that Mountjoy male prison [the chief establishment] was only visited by them once in 1880, that it was not visited at all in 1881, and only once in 1882; and that Mountjoy female prison was not visited at all in 1880 or 1881, and only once in 1882!!” (parag. 122).

7.—That the Prison of Spike Island was not closed for several years after its strong condemnation by a previous Royal Commission (parag. 134).

8.—That actually “in some cases circulars issued by the Board seem to vary the character, or meaning, of Rules made under Act of Parliament!” Here Sir R. Cross and his colleagues venture to add, “This should, of course, be carefully avoided in future!” (parag. 36). [Of course; but is such a *past* action to involve entire impunity?]

Various other serious revelations are also made. But the above are sufficient to prove the great deterioration in the administration of Irish Prisons since Sir WALTER CROFTON’S rule, which elicited praise from all parts of the civilised world.

It is to be hoped that the Home Secretary, after such damaging revelations by a Royal Commission, *not* irresponsible persons, will in future manifest more accuracy and less apathy and incredulity as to public remonstrances about prisons, and as to the too often *fictitious* visitation and inspection of those establishments by nominees of the authorities, whether Visiting Justices or others.

The Royal Commissioners should certainly have more boldly suggested the needful reforms, and not have devolved the responsibility of both suggestion and action so exclusively upon the hitherto existing administration of the Prisons. They have been exceedingly gentle in their criticisms and in

their suggested remedies (viz., one Inspector less and one Medical Officer more!) After such experiences as they have revealed, they might have boldly recommended the appointment of some one able to carry out all the necessary changes in Irish prisons, and endued with adequate powers for that purpose.

It may be remarked that many of the officers of Irish Prisons are men and women of much intelligence and good feeling.

But one of the chief causes of the very objectionable condition into which these prisons have been brought, consists in the peculiarly Irish misfortune of petty rivalries or jealousies connected with religion, or rather about mere religion-*ism*. It may surely be commended to the more serious consideration of the administrators of Irish Prisons and of their spiritual advisers, both Protestant and Catholic, that the grand fundamentals of the Christian faith upon which their Churches are agreed, are of incomparably more importance than any on which they differ; and also that their common homage to the supreme sovereignty and love of their one Divine Lord and Saviour should involve a more friendly mutual recognition as members of His human family.

MILITARY AND NAVAL PRISONERS.

If the Government wished to bring their Soldiers and Sailors into public disrepute, they could hardly devise more effectual measures than some of the present modes of dealing with military and naval offenders. For instance, as to young Sailors in the Navy, many of them, for mere disciplinary offences, are subjected to *penal servitude*, with its degrading criminal associations and excessive penalties. And as to Soldiers, the number of cases of Drunkenness, Insubordination, and Desertion, of late years, together with the numerous committals to the severe *regime* of the Military Prisons, should awaken the authorities to vigorous preventive measures.

MURDERS AND THE PENALTY OF DEATH.

Early in the year, the Right Hon. JOHN BRIGHT, M.P., wrote to the Secretary of the Howard Association, suggesting the collection, by him, of a fresh series of the statistical and other experiences of various Foreign Countries as to the punishment of Murder, whether by the Capital Penalty, or by other means.

A systematic application was accordingly made to the chief authorities of the principal nations and to the Foreign Correspondents of the Association for the needed particulars. Many comprehensive replies were kindly sent, and a large amount of statistical and other information was thus collected. Portions of this have already been published, at intervals, in various newspapers, by the Association. Other portions are available for further use and reference.

The hearty thanks of the Committee are due to many persons of eminent position who have aided this work of collection, and especially to the following:—Their Excellencies the BRITISH AMBASSADORS at ST. PETERSBURG (Sir EDWARD THORNTON), at MADRID (Sir R. B. D. MORIER), at LISBON (Sir C. L. WYKE) and at BUCHAREST (WILLIAM A. WHITE, Esq.); to WILLIAM DONALDSON, Esq., H.M. Prison Secretary for SCOTLAND; THOMAS W. GRIMSHAW, Esq., H.M. Registrar-General for IRELAND; M. YVERNES, of the Ministry of Justice, PARIS; Dr. WAHLBERG, State Councillor, of VIENNA; M. DE OLIVEKRONA, Judge at STOCKHOLM; M. LUIGI LUCCHINI, of BOLOGNA; M. BERDEN, Ministry

of Justice, BRUSSELS; M. P. B. REICHENWELD, Ministry of Justice, CHRISTIANIA; M. HEINRICH FÖHRING, Judge, HAMBURG; M. GEORGE BELINFANTE, the HAGUE; M. F. STUCKENBERG, of COPENHAGEN; M. RINGIER, Chancellor of the State, at BERNE; Mr. C. D. RANDALL, MICHIGAN, U.S.A.; Hon. A. O. BOURNE, Governor of RHODE ISLAND; Mr. CHARLES F. COFFIN, INDIANA; Mr. C. LORING BRACE, NEW YORK; Mr. ALFRED H. LOVE and Mr. JOSIAH W. LEEDS, PENNSYLVANIA; Professor WAYLAND, CONNECTICUT; Mr. E. B. POND, MICHIGAN; with others.

The general lesson to be derived from these statistics is that there is more difficulty in bringing home conviction and punishment to murderers than to any other class of criminals; that this difficulty exists in almost every country; but that it is best obviated by the greater *certainty* of conviction which is found to accompany a severe secondary punishment (imprisonment), as distinguished from the capital penalty, which involves the danger of occasionally sacrificing innocent persons to judicial mistakes.

During the year this Association has prepared and widely circulated a paper containing a collection of some of the most recent instances of mistaken conviction, as tending to illustrate the real danger and therefore the obstructive difficulty attendant on the fatal penalty in particular. The immediate occasion of this paper was the sentence to death of a man in Durham, who was, through prompt and vigorous local exertions, soon proved to have been innocent and who received his release and pardon in consequence.

Mr. BRIGHT also recently suggested to this Association the circulation of an interesting little pamphlet by Mr. HENRY DUNCKLEY ("VERAX"), of Manchester, on Capital Punishment. This hint has been complied with.

Many other papers and pamphlets on this and other topics have been circulated by the Association. (It is however to be noted that the members of this Association are not unanimous in their views upon this particular subject, which is regarded by some of them as an open question.)

The statistics received show also that the mere abolition of the capital penalty may be very mischievous unless accompanied by an effectual *substitute* of prolonged imprisonment. Thus in ROUMANIA a great increase of murders appears to have followed the disuse of the extreme penalty with the neglect of other penalties also. But successful results have ensued in HOLLAND, PORTUGAL, BELGIUM, WISCONSIN, MICHIGAN, &c., where more uniformity and certainty of repression have been adopted. SWITZERLAND has not adopted any uniform system either of executions or of their substitute. She permits a vast amount of national drunkenness and vice which naturally result in many murders and other crimes. Effectual laws to suppress the excessive intemperance in that country would be the best means of diminishing its murders.

Far more effectual than any form of *penalty* is the prevention of the *causes* and *temptations* to crime. An interesting example occurs in the statistics lately received from the French Government, by this Association. The district of CORSICA has long been noted for its bitter and fatal feuds and revengeful murders. About the period 1850, these had risen to such a pitch that during the five years ending at that date, there were committed in CORSICA, out of a population of only a quarter of a million, 431 murders and assassinations. This terrible state of violence led to the enactment of a temporary law prohibiting the carrying of weapons for five years. In the following quinquennial period the number of murders and assassinations fell to 146; which was at least a very great improvement upon the previous condition. Meanwhile the *penalty* of death for murder had remained unaltered throughout.

Similarly, in the Southern portion of the UNITED STATES, although capital punishment is often enforced, the number of murders is appalling. Why? Because of the general carrying of pistols, and the consequent temptation to use them. One of the most useful works which American philanthropists can do (whatever may be their opinions as to capital punishment), would be the "home mission work" of promoting laws in the SOUTHERN STATES against the carrying of pistols. This would prevent thousands of murders.

The Committee are taking measures to draw the attention of their American friends to this subject.

FOREIGN LABOURS.

The brief limits of this Report and the pressure of home matters, almost preclude reference to the extensive foreign labours and correspondence of the Association. But these have been actively maintained throughout the year. Many thousands of papers and packets containing information on the objects promoted by this Association have been systematically posted to the chief centres of influence and of philanthropic effort on the CONTINENT, in the UNITED STATES, INDIA, and the BRITISH COLONIES. Many applications for such assistance have been received and cheerfully responded to. Official acknowledgments are made that this work of the Association is very useful and welcome.

The Committee greatly value the communications from their Foreign friends, and especially those from the active Secretaries of the Prison Associations of FRANCE (M. F. DESPORTES), and NEW YORK (Mr. W. M. F. ROUND), from ITALY (M. BELTRANI-SCALIA), MICHIGAN (Hon. C. RANDALL), also from SPAIN (Don E. CASTELLOTE), DENMARK (Mr. F. STUCKENBERG), HOLLAND (M. BELINFANTE), SWITZERLAND (Dr. GUILLAUME), GERMANY (MM. FOHRING and KROHNE), CANADA (Mr. MOYLAN), PENNSYLVANIA (Mr. J. W. LEEDS), and from M. de OLIVEKRONA (of SWEDEN), M. BERDEN (of BELGIUM), and many others.

DEATH OF FRIENDS.

The Committee have to regret the loss of several valued friends and supporters of the Association during the past year, including Mr. JOSEPH MARRIAGE, of London, a member of the Executive Committee, Mr. THOMAS PEASE, Mr. JAMES GINGELL, of Barking, and Mr. DANIEL DONCASTER, of Sheffield, Mr. WILLIAM NORTON, Mr. S. A. MAW, Mrs. ELIZA BARCLAY, Mrs. M. MARRIOTT, Mr. CHARLES BEAVINGTON, and others.

THE SUPPORT OF THE ASSOCIATION.

The income of the Association is rather less than that of last year and only about three-fourths of what it was several years ago. Its operations have been, in consequence, somewhat restricted, and this year ends with a *debit* balance. The Committee have, however, to thank those kind friends who have encouraged their exertions. A letter from one of these, in particular, may be here quoted. He writes that "the Howard Association has done more for the benefit of society than perhaps any other in the land, *in proportion to the money at its command*," and he encloses £5 as an annual subscription.

The few hundred pounds which constitute the annual income of the Association have however again enabled the Committee to carry on an extensive cosmopolitan, as well as home advocacy, of their several objects.

HOWARD ASSOCIATION, 1883-84.

Dr.	BALANCE SHEET.			Cr.
	£	s.	d.	£ s. d.
To Subscriptions and Donations	619	14	8	
„ Subscriptions received after the Audit of last year, but acknowledged in its Report	18	17	0	
„ Balance over, last year.....	1	17	4	
„ Balance (<i>deficiency</i>) this year	5	1	4	
	<u>£645</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	
				By Printing and Press Expenses, Papers, Books, Postage, &c.*
				239 19 2
				„ Special Efforts (Pauper and Neglected Children, Prisons, &c.)
				111 7 8
				„ Salary.....
				225 0 0
				„ General Office Expenses ...
				52 6 0
				„ Travelling
				16 17 6
				<u>£645 10 4</u>

Audited, compared with the Vouchers, and found correct,
August 30th, 1884.

EDMUND STURGE.

* N.B.—This only represents a small portion of the printing of the Association, inasmuch as most of the information diffused by its means is through the use of the newspaper press, thereby obtaining a very large circulation at a comparatively small expense.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.

1883-84.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Francis Peek, Esq. (Special) ...	50	0	0	Arthur Lister, Esq., J.P. ...	3	0	0
John H. Chance, Esq. ...	12	2	0	Richard Allen, Esq. (Dublin) ...	2	2	0
Arthur Albright, Esq. ...	10	0	0	Richard Barrett, Esq. ...	2	2	0
John Baily, Esq. ...	10	0	0	Messrs. Thomas Barlow & Brother	2	2	0
J. Gurney Barclay, Esq., J.P. ...	10	0	0	Robert L. Chance, Esq. ...	2	2	0
John Horniman, Esq. ...	10	0	0	Mrs. C. R. Charleton ...	2	2	0
Arthur Pease, Esq., M.P. ...	10	0	0	Messrs. James Chesterman & Co.	2	2	0
Sir Joseph W. Pease, Bart., M.P.	10	0	0	Colonel A. A. Croll, J.P. ...	2	2	0
Henry Fell Pease, Esq., J.P. ...	10	0	0	Thomas Emmott, Esq., J.P. ...	2	2	0
William Pollard, Esq., J.P. ...	10	0	0	Lewis Fry, Esq., M.P. ...	2	2	0
Miss Hester Rich ...	10	0	0	Exors. of late James Gingell, Esq.	2	2	0
John Rylands, Esq., J.P. ...	10	0	0	H. Edmund Gurney, Esq. ...	2	2	0
Samuel Smith, Esq., M.P. ...	10	0	0	Dr. Thomas Hodgkin ...	2	2	0
Messrs. Tangye Brothers ...	10	0	0	Misses Jowitt ...	2	2	0
John Edward Wilson, Esq., J.P.	10	0	0	Alexander McArthur, Esq., M.P.	2	2	0
Hugh Mason, Esq., M.P. ...	5	5	0	George McFerran, Esq....	2	2	0
James E. Backhouse, Esq., J.P.	5	0	0	Mrs. E. P. Nichol ...	2	2	0
Mrs. K. Backhouse ...	5	0	0	James Reckitt, Esq. ...	2	2	0
H. Ford Barclay, Esq., J.P. ...	5	0	0	Francis Reckitt, Esq., J.P. ...	2	2	0
Mrs. Eliza Barclay ...	5	0	0	William Sommerville, Esq., J.P.	2	2	0
John Baring, Esq., J.P....	5	0	0	Mrs. E. G. Thomas ...	2	2	0
Frederick Braby, Esq., J.P. ...	5	0	0	Thomas Wilson, Esq. ...	2	2	0
Isaac Braithwaite, Esq. ...	5	0	0	Rev. Arthur O'Neill ...	2	1	0
The Earl of Derby ...	5	0	0	Thomas Wm. Backhouse, Esq....	2	0	0
Mrs. Sarah Gibbins ...	5	0	0	Mrs. Ann Brunton ...	2	0	0
J. Tindall Harris, Esq....	5	0	0	S. Gurney Buxton, Esq., J.P. ...	2	0	0
George B. Lloyd, Esq., J.P. ...	5	0	0	Frederick Crowley, Esq. ...	2	0	0
George Palmer, Esq., M.P. ...	5	0	0	Mrs. Crowley ...	2	0	0
Mrs. Charles Pease ...	5	0	0	Mrs. Sarah Firth ...	2	0	0
Mrs. Gurney Pease ...	5	0	0	Philip Goldschmidt, Esq., J.P.			
Miss P. H. Peckover ...	5	0	0	(Mayor of Manchester) ...	2	0	0
O. F. Routh, Esq. ...	5	0	0	John Groom, Esq. ...	2	0	0
Mrs. Russell Scott ...	5	0	0	Misses M. A. and H. Hewitson	2	0	0
George Sturge, Esq. ...	5	0	0	Richard Holdsworth, Esq. ...	2	0	0
Peter A. Taylor, Esq. ...	5	0	0	Joseph Huntley, Esq. ...	2	0	0
Sir Charles E. Trevelyan, Bart.	5	0	0	Joseph Marriage, Esq. ...	2	0	0
The Duke of Westminster ...	5	0	0	Mrs. Sarah Mason ...	2	0	0
Alfred Braby, Esq. ...	3	10	0	John Noble, Esq., J.P. ...	2	0	0
Stafford Allen, Esq. ...	3	3	0	William Norton, Esq. ...	2	0	0
Frederick C. Bryant, Esq. ...	3	3	0	Miss Annie E. Pease ...	2	0	0
John Cory, Esq., J.P. ...	3	3	0	Alfred Priestman, Esq. ...	2	0	0
John Gurney, Esq., J.P. ...	3	3	0	James N. Richardson, Esq. ...	2	0	0
Joseph B. Mead, Esq. ...	3	3	0	James Hack Tuke, Esq. ...	2	0	0
Messrs. John Priestman & Co. ...	3	3	0	Charles Wilson, Esq. ...	2	0	0
M. W. ...	3	0	0	C. Stansfield Wilson, Esq. ...	2	0	0

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
W. L. Alexander, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Titus Salt, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0
"Alpha" ...	1	1	0	Richard Shackelton, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0
Morris Ashby, Esq. ...	1	1	0	S. Gurney Sheppard, Esq. ...	1	1	0
John Barran, Esq., M.P. ...	1	1	0	John W. Shorthouse, Esq. ...	1	1	0
Messrs. Barrett, Sons & Co. ...	1	1	0	Messrs. Sim & Coventry ...	1	1	0
James Barlow, Esq. (Bolton) ...	1	1	0	William Henry Simpson, Esq. ...	1	1	0
Robert Benson, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Alfred Southall, Esq. ...	1	1	0
William Bond, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	James Smith, Esq., J.P. (Liverpool) ...	1	1	0
John Bottomley, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Alfred Sparkes, Esq. ...	1	1	0
Misses M. and S. A. Bragg ...	1	1	0	Martin Hope Sutton, Esq. ...	1	1	0
J. Bevan Braithwaite, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Alfred Sutton, Esq. ...	1	1	0
Joseph Brown, Esq. (Liverpool) ...	1	1	0	Edmund Sturge, Esq. ...	1	1	0
Henry Brown, Esq., J.P. (Luton) ...	1	1	0	Messrs. Tangyes & Holman ...	1	1	0
Joel Cadbury, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Messrs. Tanner Brothers ...	1	1	0
Joseph Carrick, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Herbert Thomas, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0
Richard D. Catchpool, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Messrs. Joseph Town & Sons ...	1	1	0
L. T. Cave, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Messrs. J. & E. Waters & Co. ...	1	1	0
John Chadwick, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Messrs. Wertheimer, Lea & Co. ...	1	1	0
Francis C. Clayton, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Mark Whitwill, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0
Thomas Collinson, Esq. ...	1	1	0	John F. Wilkey, Esq. ...	1	1	0
Messrs. Joseph Conyers & Sons ...	1	1	0	Charles Wise, Esq. ...	1	1	0
John Corbett, Esq., M.P. ...	1	1	0	Messrs. T. & A. Wright ...	1	1	0
Mrs. E. W. Crosfield ...	1	1	0	Charles Ashby, Esq. ...	1	0	0
David Dale, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Mrs. Martha Binyon ...	1	0	0
Robert Dawbarn, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Mrs. William Brewin ...	1	0	0
Daniel Doncaster, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Jacob Bright, Esq., M.P. ...	1	0	0
Andrew Dunn, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Henry Brown, Esq. (Norwich) ...	1	0	0
William F. Ecroyd, Esq., M.P. ...	1	1	0	Misses R. and A. B. Brown ...	1	0	0
Edward Ecroyd, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Theodore H. Bryant, Esq. ...	1	0	0
John B. Edmondson, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Miss M. A. Burgess ...	1	0	0
Mrs. E. S. Ellis ...	1	1	0	Jonathan Burt, Esq. ...	1	0	0
John R. Ford, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Henry Burlingham, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Joseph H. Fox, Esq. (Wellington) ...	1	1	0	John Cadbury, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Joseph Storrs Fry, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Messrs. Cadbury Brothers ...	1	0	0
Robert Gladstone, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Henry G. Chalkley, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Cornelius Hanbury, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Arthur Clark, Esq. (Exeter) ...	1	0	0
Thomas Harris, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Isaac B. Cooke, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Mrs. William Hargreaves ...	1	1	0	Sir William Collins (Glasgow) ...	1	0	0
William Harvey, Esq. (Leeds) ...	1	1	0	Messrs. Sidney Cooper & Co. ...	1	0	0
Abraham Haworth, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	William Henry Ellis, Esq., J.P. ...	1	0	0
Jesse Haworth, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Messrs. Joseph Ellis & Sons ...	1	0	0
Thomas Holder, Esq., J.P. (Mayor of Liverpool) ...	1	1	0	Joseph Firth, Esq. (Wakefield) ...	1	0	0
H. H. Hornby, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Joshua Fisher, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Joseph Jesper, Esq. ...	1	1	0	A Leeds Friend ...	1	0	0
Caleb R. Kemp, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Thomas Smith Harvey, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Henry Lee, Esq., M.P. ...	1	1	0	Thomas Harvey, Esq. (Leeds) ...	1	0	0
Messrs. T. Leicester & Sons ...	1	1	0	Frederick Hill, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Thomas Letchworth, Esq. ...	1	1	0	J. B. Hodgkin, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Alderman Sir W. McArthur, M.P. ...	1	1	0	J. S. Hopkins ...	1	0	0
Messrs. Macfie & Sons ...	1	1	0	Misses H. M. and R. Hopkins ...	1	0	0
George Macrae, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	William H. Horniman, Esq. ...	1	0	0
William Middlemore, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Mrs. J. Hurnard ...	1	0	0
M. M. Monro, Esq. ...	1	1	0	George Hurst, Esq., J.P. ...	1	0	0
Charles C. Morland, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Gilbert G. Kennedy, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Edmund K. Muspratt, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	William H. King, Esq. ...	1	0	0
John Patterson, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	R. R. Meade-King, Esq. ...	1	0	0
William Pickard, Esq. ...	1	1	0	J. King, Jun., Esq. (Manchester) ...	1	0	0
Jonathan Pim, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Mrs. Ann King ...	1	0	0
Wyndham S. Portal, Esq., J.P. ...	1	1	0	Joseph Lingford, Esq. ...	1	0	0
James S. Rahdell, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Richard Littleboy, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Mrs. J. T. Rice ...	1	1	0	Samuel A. Maw, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Joseph Rowntree, Esq. ...	1	1	0	Edward B. Mounsey, Esq. ...	1	0	0
Mrs. Sarah Rowntree ...	1	1	0	John Mounsey, Esq. ...	1	0	0
				George William Palmer, Esq. ...	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Alfred Palmer, Esq. ...	1	0	0	Robert Longdon, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Mrs. Thomas Pease ...	1	0	0	Isaac Milner, Esq. ...	0	10	0
J. R. ...	1	0	0	W. W. Morrell, Esq. ...	0	10	0
William Simpson, Jun., Esq. ...	1	0	0	Robert H. Penney, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Mrs. Ann Snowdon ...	1	0	0	Messrs. Player, Brothers ...	0	10	0
Mrs. Ann Southall ...	1	0	0	John W. Procter, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Mrs. J. Spence (York) ...	1	0	0	T. Pumphrey, Esq. (Newcastle)	0	10	0
Miss Anne Stephenson ...	1	0	0	Thomas E. Pumphrey, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Samuel B. Stevens, Esq. ...	1	0	0	Alfred Ransom, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Walter Sturge, Esq. ...	1	0	0	William Ransom, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Captain Verney, R.N. ...	1	0	0	Samuel Rosling, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Mrs. Lydia T. Walker ...	1	0	0	Alfred Rosling, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Wilson Waterfall, Esq., J.P. ...	1	0	0	William Rowntree, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	0
Alfred Webb, Esq. (Dublin) ...	1	0	0	George Rooke, Esq. ...	0	10	0
John Wilson, Esq. (Bradford) ...	1	0	0	James P. Scrutton, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Henry Richardson, Esq. (York)	0	15	0	William Southall, Esq. ...	0	10	0
John Bottomley, Esq. (London)	0	10	6	George Shaw, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Joshua Brough, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	6	John Sharp, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Joseph Fairfax, Esq. ...	0	10	6	J. S. Stansfield, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Joseph W. Goddard, Esq. ...	0	10	6	Charles Sturge, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	0
James Marshall, Esq. ...	0	10	6	C. Dickinson Sturge, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Miss Marriott ...	0	10	6	Wilson Sturge, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Miss E. Marriott ...	0	10	6	Henry Tennant, Esq. ...	0	10	0
R. F. Martineau, Esq. ...	0	10	6	Charles Thompson, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	0
Richard Nicholson, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	6	James Thompson, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	0
Walter Priestman, Esq. ...	0	10	6	Edwin O. Tregelles, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Herbert Sutton, Esq. ...	0	10	6	Misses E. and C. Tweedy ...	0	10	0
A. Campbell Tiley, Esq. ...	0	10	6	Robert Walker, Esq. (Leicester)	0	10	0
Joshua Whiting, Esq. ...	0	10	6	William Watson, Esq. (Newcastle)	0	10	0
John M. Albright, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Alfred West, Esq. (Hull)	0	10	0
Messrs. Alexander Ireland & Co.	0	10	0	Frederick Wheeler, Esq. ...	0	10	0
George Baker, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	0	John Whiting, Esq. ...	0	10	0
John E. Baker, Esq. ...	0	10	0	W. S. Wilson, Esq. ...	0	10	0
James Backhouse, Esq. (York) ...	0	10	0	Henry J. Wilson, Esq. (Sheffield)	0	10	0
George Barrow, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Miss E. Gertrude Wilson ...	0	10	0
Thomas Barrow, Esq. ...	0	10	0	B. Yerbury, Esq. ...	0	10	0
Richard C. Barrow, Esq. ...	0	10	0	John Barrow, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Thomas Beach, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Benjamin Blower, Esq. ...	0	5	0
John Bevans, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Samuel J. Capper, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Richard Binns, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Thomas Crosfield, Esq. ...	0	5	0
James Boorne, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	0	Richard Dell, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Thomas Blain, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Thomas Drewry, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Christopher Bradshaw, Esq. ...	0	10	0	J. T. Ellerbeck, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Mrs. Hannah Brady ...	0	10	0	Mrs. M. A. Elliott ...	0	5	0
C. L. Braithwaite, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	0	Miss Mary Elliott ...	0	5	0
Francis Brown, Esq. ...	0	10	0	A. J. Foxwell, Esq. ...	0	5	0
R. Gopsill Brown, Esq. ...	0	10	0	W. H. Glasspool, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Miss S. M. Cash ...	0	10	0	Henry Grace, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Miss E. G. Dimsdale ...	0	10	0	John T. Grace, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Charles Doncaster, Esq. ...	0	10	0	James Grace, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Daniel Doncaster, Jun., Esq. ...	0	10	0	Edmund Harvey, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Joseph J. Dymond, Esq. ...	0	10	0	T. B. Hawksworth, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Alexander Fothergill, Esq. ...	0	10	0	L. S. Houseman, Esq. ...	0	5	0
William Fothergill, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Richard Irwin, Esq. ...	0	5	0
John H. Glaisyer, Esq. ...	0	10	0	John Jacob, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Thomas Gregory, Esq. ...	0	10	0	John Messer, Esq. ...	0	5	0
George Grierson, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Edward Mounsey, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Joseph Hadwen, Esq. ...	0	10	0	William Norman, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Robert Heriot, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Samuel Price, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Arthur Hill, Esq. ...	0	10	0	S. B. Pumphrey, Esq. ...	0	5	0
William H. Holmes, Esq. ...	0	10	0	Charles Pumphrey, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Charles Hoyland, Esq. ...	0	10	0	John Rowntree, Esq. ...	0	5	0
Mrs. R. P. Hutchinson ...	0	10	0	Thomas Salthouse, Esq. ...	0	5	0
John Jowitt, Esq., J.P. ...	0	10	0	Norman Southall, Esq. ...	0	5	0

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.		
Miss Finch Smith (1883)	...	0	5	0	William A. Watkins, Esq.	...	0	5	0
Ditto (1884)	...	0	5	0	Thomas Westcombe, Esq.	...	0	5	0
John Stansfield, Esq. ...	...	0	5	0	William White, Esq. ...	...	0	5	0
Hall Stansfield, Esq. ...	...	0	5	0	Smaller sums ...	...	0	6	6
Charles E. Stevens, Esq.	...	0	5	0	Interest (on Debenture)	...	1	18	8
Jonathan Walker, Esq.	...	0	5	0					

RECEIVED SINCE THE AUDIT, 1884.

Mrs. George S. Gibson	...	...	...	£5	0	0
George R. Vicars, Esq.	...	...	...	2	0	0
James Houldsworth, Esq. (Coltness)	...	1	1	0		
"A Friend"	...	...	...	1	0	0

SUGGESTED FORM OF BEQUEST TO THE ASSOCIATION.

"I give to the TREASURER, for the time being, or to the person for the time being acting as such, of the HOWARD ASSOCIATION, established in London in 1866, for the promotion of the best methods of the Treatment and Prevention of Crime, and whose receipt I direct shall be a sufficient discharge for the same, the sum of £——— sterling, to be applied for the general purposes of the said Association, and to be fully paid out of such part of my personal estate as is legally applicable to such purpose."

* * * It is an additional assistance to the Association when subscribers and donors kindly and spontaneously forward their contributions through the post. Post Office Orders and Cheques to be made payable to the Secretary (WILLIAM TALLACK), 5, Bishopsgate Street Without, London, E.C.

